

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. VII

AUGUST, 1936

No. 8

Die Bedeutung der Predigt bei Luther.*)

„Es ist alles besser nachgelassen denn das Wort, und ist nichts besser getrieben denn das Wort. Denn daß dasselbe im Schwang unter den Christen gehen sollte, zeigt die ganze Schrift an, und auch Christus selber sagt (Luk. 10, 42): ‚Eins ist vonnöten‘, nämlich daß Maria zu Christi Füßen sitze und höre sein Wort täglich; das ist das beste Teil, das zu erwählen ist und nimmer weggenommen wird. Es ist ein ewig Wort; das andere muß alles vergehen, wieviel es auch der Martha zu schaffen gibt.“ Was Luther hier fordert, hat er selber immer besser und umfassender, immer kühner und kündlicher zu verwirkllichen gesucht: das Wort zu treiben; nicht bloß als Prediger auf der Kanzel oder im Haus, sondern auch als Professor im Hörsaal, als „Prophet der Deutschen“ in seinen deutschen Schriften, für Freund und Feind in seinen Briefen, für seine Tischgenossen zu Hause. Die Predigten im engeren Sinne unterschieden sich bei ihm eigentlich nur durch den Ort, das heißt, durch den besonderen gottesdienstlichen Anlaß und die besondere Hörerschaft, die sich dabei als Gemeinde zusammenfand.

Daß Luther das Wort und nur das Wort treiben wollte, das unterscheidet seine Predigten grundlegend von vielem, was heute als Predigt üblich ist. Luther wollte in ihnen nicht das, was er religiös erlebt und erlitten hatte, aussagen. Sie sind freilich nebenbei auch Zeugnisse seiner religiösen Genialität und seiner menschlichen Tiefe und Größe; aber das ist nur eine Begleiterscheinung, nicht das Wesen. Denn Luther predigte nicht sich selber, sondern er richtete eine Botschaft, ein Wort aus, das er selber ohne sein Verdienst empfangen und nun kraft seiner Berufung zum Predigtamt bei Verlust seiner ewigen Seligkeit auszurichten hatte. Ebensowenig wollte Luther in seinen Predigten etwa seine „neuen Gedanken“ über die Bibel, über die Lehre Jesu und der Apostel usw. der aufhorchenden Welt vortragen; auch stehen seine Pre-

*) Abdruck (mit Genehmigung) aus der Einführung in Band III der Calwer Lutherausgabe, der ausgewählte Predigten Luthers bietet.

digten nicht im Dienst irgendwelcher menschlichen Ziele und Pläne, etwa im Dienst der „reformatorischen Bewegung“. Sondern darum ging es ihm, daß durch seinen Dienst das Wort selbst unverfälscht, lauter und rein an den Tag komme.

Dieses Wort Gottes bezeugt dem Menschen, daß Gott der Herr ist. Alle Predigt hat für Luther das erste Gebot zur Voraussetzung. Das ist höchste Zusage [?] und zugleich höchste Forderung. Der natürliche Mensch mit dem Zutrauen zur eigenen Kraft nimmt es als eine Aufforderung, der er durch seine eigenen „guten Werke“ nachzukommen habe. Er hört die Wotschaft von Gott als Gesetz; in seinem eigenen Gewissen bezeugt sich ihm der fordernde Gotteswillen, und die Predigt des Mose-Gesetzes vom Sinai, der Zehn Gebote, verschärft ihm diese angeborene Kenntnis des Gotteswillens. Er hofft, sich das Wohlgefallen Gottes verdienen zu können; er meint, seine eigne Leistung bringe Gott dazu, daß er sein Gott sei. Aber notwendig scheitert er auf diesem Wege und muß, wenn er aufrichtig ist, seine Ohnmacht und Armut entdecken. Es kommt zur Erkenntnis der Schuld, zur Erfahrung des Zornes Gottes, der auf dem Übertreter liegt, zur Verzweiflung. Diese Bewegung des Menschen von unten nach oben führt also nicht zum Ziel. Und je eher der Mensch das merkt, desto besser für ihn; desto offener [?] wird er für die ganz andere Predigt des Evangeliums. Deshalb hat Luther in der Predigt des Gesetzes die nötige Vorbereitung gesehen, um unfreie frevelhafte Sicherheit zu zerschlagen, und er hat darum immer wieder mit Bewußtsein Gesetz gepredigt. Er hat die Zustände an Gottes Geboten gemessen und ist nachdrücklich gegen alle offenkundigen Schäden zu Feld gezogen; herhaft hat er die Dinge beim Namen genannt und dabei weit hinein in die Gebiete weltlicher Ordnung gegriffen. Aber er war sich dabei immer bewußt, ein „fremdes Werk“ zu tun. Denn er war Prediger des Evangeliums.

Die Predigt des Evangeliums nimmt ihren Ausgang ebenfalls an der Gewißheit des ersten Gebotes, daß Gott der Herr ist. Aber hier geht nun die Bewegung umgekehrt. Hier handelt Gott, und der Mensch empfängt im Glauben. Hier vollbringt nicht der Mensch ein Werk und wartet auf Gottes anerkennende Antwort, sondern hier schenkt sich der Herr dem Menschen, und der Mensch antwortet darauf in Glauben und Gehorsam. Ganz oben hebt also diese Bewegung an: im Herzen des ewigen Gottes, der will, daß allen Menschen geholfen werde und alle unter seine Herrschaft, in sein Reich kommen. Dazu offenbarte er sich: er sandte seinen Sohn, den Menschen Jesus Christus, den er von Anfang der Welt verkündigen ließ durch die Propheten, und der kam, als die Zeit erfüllt war. Dieser Sohn will uns in des Vaters Reich ziehen; ihn „jammerte des Volks“; er streckt seine Hand nach seinen Menschenbrüdern aus und macht sie zu Zeugen seiner Gnade. In der Kirche aber als der Schar derer, die im Alten und im Neuen Bund von ihm ergriffen sind, wirkt sich diese Bewegung der Gnade weiter aus: die

Propheten und Apostel als die von ihm selber berufenen Zeugen und die von der Kirche berufenen Prediger, die das maßgebende Zeugnis der Apostel und Propheten aufnehmen und weitertragen, sind der verlängerte Arm Gottes, mit dem er nach uns greift. Indem sie Christus als den von Gott gegebenen Herrn predigen, predigt Christus selbst; indem sie das Wort von Gottes Herrschaft bezeugen, bezeugt Gott sein Wort durch sie. „Unser Herr Gott will allein Prediger sein.“ So sagt es Jesu Wort, Luk. 10, 16: „Wer euch höret, der höret mich; und wer euch verachtet, der verachtet mich; und wer mich verachtet, der verachtet den, der mich gesandt hat.“

Dieses Neden Gottes im Evangelium bereitet freilich dem Menschen sein schweres Ärgernis. Es widerspricht dem menschlichen Stolz, der in heldischer Haltung sein Schicksal selbst formen will. Vor Gottes Gnade wird alle menschliche Größe, Macht, Weisheit und Frömmigkeit zunichten, und weder der „gute Wille“ noch auch die Vernunft bringen uns Gott einen einzigen Schritt näher. „Christus predigen heißt das Fleisch vor den Kopf stoßen; das Fleisch predigen heißt Christus vor den Kopf stoßen.“ Und ebenso anstößig wie die Botschaft von der Gnade sind auch ihre Verkünder. Das Neden Gottes geschieht in einer tiefen Verhüllung. Der Heiland der Welt ist ein Glied des jüdischen Volkes, der König liegt in einer Krippe, der Schuldlose wird als Sünder gerichtet, der Lebensfürst stirbt am Kreuze. Und auch das Urzeugnis von ihm, die Heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments, ist verfaßt von Menschen fremder Zeiten, Zonen und Rassen, und dazu von Menschen, die sich wie ein Brand aus dem Feuer gerettet wußten. Und die Predigt von ihm bis zum heutigen Tage wird ausgerichtet von Leuten, deren Fehler und Untauglichkeit jedermann sieht; wie sollten sie Gottes Werkzeuge sein? Sie, in ihrem Stolz oder in ihren Minderwertigkeitsgefühlen, sie in ihren Sünden und Tugenden, sie mit den Sympathien, die sie als Menschen genießen, und mit der Ablehnung, die sie als Menschen erfahren, sind doch schwerstes Hemmnis für das Handeln Gottes?

Luther weiß um das alles. Aber er weiß auch von dem Wunder Gottes, daß das Kind in der Krippe der Sohn des Vaters war, daß der ins Grab Gelegte auferstand; daß die Bibel in all ihrer Menschlichkeit die Windel ist, darein Christus gelegt ist; daß der Prediger auf der Kanzel kraft der Vergebung Gottes wirken kann und muß. Und Luther rechnet glaubend damit, daß dieses Wunder geschieht: „Gott will es nicht geringer achten, wenn ein Mensch predigt, denn als hätte er's selbst getan.“ Diese Gewißheit soll ein Prediger haben. Gerade darum muß „ein Prediger nicht das Vaterunfer beten noch Vergebung der Sünden suchen, wenn er gepredigt hat (sofern er ein rechter Prediger ist), sondern muß mit Jeremia sagen und rühmen: „Herr, du weißt, daß das, was aus meinem Munde gegangen ist, recht und dir gefällig ist“; ja er muß mit Paulus und allen Aposteln und Propheten

trozig sagen: „Das hat Gott selbst gesagt“, und wiederum: „Ich bin ein Apostel und Prophet Jesu Christi in dieser Predigt gewesen.“ Hier ist nicht nötig, ja nicht gut, Vergebung der Sünden zu erbitten, als wäre es unrecht gelehrt gewesen; denn es ist Gottes und nicht mein Wort, das mir Gott nicht vergeben soll noch kann, sondern das er bestätigen, loben, krönen und zu dem er sagen will: „Du hast recht gelehrt; denn ich habe durch dich geredet, und das Wort ist mein.“ Wer solches nicht von seiner Predigt rühmen kann, der lasse das Predigen anstehen; denn er lügt gewißlich und lästert Gott.“

Der christliche Prediger ist also Diener des Allerhöchsten und nicht Diener der Menschen. Er ist ganz an Gott gebunden und darum unabhängig von Lob und Tadel der Menschen. „Lasst uns auf Gottes Ehre predigen und nicht auf die Urteile der Menschen achten! Kann's jemand besser, der mache es besser.“ „Wenn ich auf die Kanzel steige, so sehe ich keinen Menschen an, sondern meine, es seien lauter Klöpfe, die da vor mir stehen, und rede meines Gottes Wort dahin.“ Der Prediger kann sich der Verpflichtung, das Wort Gottes zu sagen, auf keine Weise entziehen; auch die Undankbarkeit der Welt, die Verachtung, die sie auf ihn legt, die Verfolgung, die sie über ihn bringt, die Gefährdung seines Lebens, mit der sie ihn bedroht, darf ihn nicht an seinem Auftrag irre machen. Ebensowenig darf er sich durch innere Unfechtungen davon abbringen lassen, weder durch sein mangelndes Verständnis der Schrift noch durch seinen Unglauben.

Es ist freilich eine schwere Last auf den Prediger gelegt, wenn er Gottes Wort verkündigen soll. So hat auch Luther von sich selber bezeugt: „Ich habe mich nie darüber entsezt, daß ich nicht gut predigen könnte. Aber davor habe ich mich oft entsezt und gefürchtet, daß ich vor Gottes Angesicht von der großen Majestät und von dem göttlichen Wesen habe reden sollen und müßten. Darum seid nur stark und betet!“ „Glaubt mir, daß die Predigt kein menschliches Werk ist, und seid als Prediger nicht vermeissen, sondern fürchtet Gott. Denn ich, der ich doch ein alter und geübter Prediger bin, fürchte mich noch bis zum heutigen Tag, wenn ich predigen soll.“

Trotz seiner Schwere ist aber für Luther der Auftrag des Predigers doch erfüllbar. Denn der Prediger holt ja, was er sagt, nicht aus sich selbst, sondern er hat die Bezeugnisse der Apostel und Propheten vor sich als Richtschnur, und diese sind eindeutig und hell. So braucht er also nichts anderes zu sein als ein getreuer Haushalter über die ihm anvertraute Botschaft vom Anbruch der Herrschaft Gottes. Predigen heißt darum den biblischen Text auslegen, um die Gemeinde zu Christus zu führen. Luther behandelt ihn nicht bloß als geschichtliche Urkunde, ebensowenig bloß als Quelle eines theologischen Gedankensystems; sondern er „trägt die Schrift herfür“ als das Beugnis von dem Christus für uns. Es ist ihm nur um das eine zu tun, den Text, wie er gerne sagt, „auszustreichen“, das heißtt, ihm Farbe und Ton zu geben, so daß

er zu einer lebendigen, hellen, einheitlichen, verständlichen Botschaft für die Gemeinde wird. So hält er sich streng an die Sache, sucht jeden Text in seiner Eigentümlichkeit zu erfassen und verschmäht jede rednerische Kunst. Luther knüpft nicht irgendwo an, etwa bei der Tatsache eines Festes oder bei einer Stimmung seiner Hörer, sondern er setzt sofort beim Text selber ein; er baut keine Brücken vom Hörer zum Text, um etwa der zögernden Vernunft Gottes Wundertaten zu beweisen oder um durch besonders geistliche Redeweise die sanfte Zugänglichkeit frommer Andacht auszunützen oder um durch Eingehen auf die Interessen und Nöte der Gegenwart die Ohren erst zahn und willig zu machen. Nein, die frohe Botschaft von Christus ist von Gott für die ganze Welt bestimmt; damit ist sie auch schon auf den wirklichen Menschen abgestimmt, wie er zu allen Zeiten vor Gott als der gottlose, von Tod, Sünde und Fleisch beherrschte Gefangene des Satans dasteht. Mit diesem Verzicht auf alle künstliche Anknüpfung bei der Gemeinde gewinnt so Luther die wahre Anknüpfung bei dem Menschen, der mit der Not seines Hochmuts und seiner Verzweiflung in allen Ständen und Berufen, in allen Geschlechtern und Lebensaltern, in allen Kleidern und Uniformen ein und derselbe Mensch ist: der Mensch, dessen Elend übermachen Gott in Ewigkeit jammerte.

Diesen wirklichen Menschen sucht nun Luthers Predigt auch tatsächlich zu erreichen. Das Verschmähen jeder falschen Anknüpfung bedeutet nicht, daß die Predigt nun zeitentrukt wäre. Im Gegenteil, Luthers Predigt ist ganz gegenwartsnah und wirklichkeitsgemäß gewesen, so daß es nicht erlaubt ist, etwa Luthers Predigt einfach nachzuahmen. Er spricht das Wort Gottes in die Herzen der damaligen Hörer hinein. Er legt den Text aus für diese seine Gemeinde, die vor ihm sitzt. Er bezeugt den Christus für diese Wittenberger des 16. Jahrhunderts. Er geißelt die Zeitfünden, er kämpft gegen die zeitgenössischen Irrlehrnen und Verlehrungen des Evangeliums. Dort reiht er seiner Zeit die frommen Masken vom Gesicht, hinter welchen sie ihre Gottlosigkeit verbirgt, dort tröstet er die Verzagten; er droht und verheißt; er lohnt und wehrt — immer, wie es die Lage fordert. Denn Ziel der Predigt ist ja, daß der wirkliche Hörer den Text verstehe. Dem dienen alle die vielbemernten Eigenschaften von Luthers Predigt. Ob er Gelehrte von Weltkraut, ob er Fürsten und Vornehme vor sich sitzen hat, er predigt immer künstlos und redet in ganz natürlicher Weise, so daß die einfachsten Leute ihn verstehen können. So schlicht, anschaulich, bildhaft, oft derb ist seine Rede, daß sich bei ihm eine Predigt äußerlich gar nicht unterscheidet von der Weise, wie er sonst, etwa am Tisch, zu reden pflegte. Er kennt nicht die Teilung in eine „geistliche“ Art zu reden, die sich etwa durch Salbung des Vortrags und die Sprache Kanaans auszeichnen würde, und in eine „weltliche“ Art zu reden, bei der man sich natürlich gäbe; sondern das Wort Gottes ist ja Wort an den Menschen, wie er ist, und darum durchdringt es für Luther den Alltag so gut

wie es den Gottesdienst heiligt. So redet er zu Melanchthon nicht anders als zu Kindern und Mägden; er läßt sich zu seinen Hörern herab und ist darum besorgt, daß sie etwas von dem Gehörten nach Hause nehmen; dazu scheut er sich auch nicht vor Wiederholungen. Wenn er nicht eine ganze Geschichte anschaulich als für uns geschehen seinen Hörern nahezücht, so greift er meist nur einen Spruch heraus, um den nun ganz deutlich zu machen. Aus derselben Rücksicht auf die Fassungskraft seiner Gemeinde spricht er auch langsam und beschleicht sich im Unterschied von den vielstündigen Predigten des späten Mittelalters einer grundsätzlichen Kürze (eine Stunde).

Gottes Wort will gehört und geglaubt und bekannt und gelebt werden; darum sucht es die rechten Hörer und Täter. „Wir sollen Gott fürchten und lieben, daß wir die Predigt und sein Wort nicht verachten, sondern daselbe heilig halten, gerne hören und lernen“, sagt Luther hiezu in der Erklärung zum dritten Gebot. Ein „Predigt-publikum“ von heute, das gewohnt ist, religiöse Reden oder Reden über Religion von der Kanzel zu erwarten, hat mit einer Gemeinde des Wortes nichts zu tun; denn das Wort, wie Luther es trieb, ruft uns ja eben weg von dem Wichtigtum mit dem eignen frommen Erleben und von dem Bestaunen des eigenen frommen Denkens, damit wir uns selber loslassen und Christus uns ergreife. Auch hat bei Luther eine recht hörende Gemeinde keinen Anlaß, sich irgendwie an die Person des „Kanzelredners“ zu klammern; denn der Prediger tritt ja völlig zurück hinter dem, was er auszurichten hat als Bote. Sofern er aber in die Erscheinung tritt, steht er — der „arme stinkende Madensack“ — in keiner Weise über der Gemeinde, sondern verharzt mit ihr in derselben Tiefe, in die allein Gottes Erbarmen hinabreicht. Der Hörer ist vielmehr verpflichtet, selber zu entscheiden, ob die Predigt mit der Schrift übereinstimme. Stimmt sie aber damit überein, so hat er darauf zu hören, als ob er die hohe Majestät Gottes selber höre. „Darum so siehe nicht nach der Person, sondern höre, was man sagt, nicht wer da redet; siehe, ob's Gott durch sie redet oder tut. Ist's also, daß Gott redet, so ducke dich; und wenn ein Bürger oder Bauer einen Prediger hört, sollte er sagen: Ich höre wohl und erkenne die Stimme des Pfarrers; aber die Worte, so er redet, stammen nicht von seiner Person — seine Person ist zu schwach dazu —, sondern die hohe Majestät Gottes redet durch sie.“

Daß der Hörer eine Predigt so hören kann, ist freilich nicht sein eigenes Verdienst, sondern hier geschieht das Wunder des Glaubens, das nicht kleiner ist als das Wunder des Predigens. Hier öffnet Gott selbst durch seinen Geist das Ohr des Hörers, lehrt das Wort in den Worten und Wörtern erfassen, malt das Bild des Christus als des Christus für uns vor die Seele und lehrt in ihm den Vater erkennen; und damit macht er den Hörer zum Glied der Gemeinde, die Gottes Willen zu erfüllen bereit ist im Tun und Leiden, oder, wie Luther es auch aus-

drückt, dann nimmt Christus selber im Glaubenden Wohnung (wie er auch in der Gemeinde wohnt) und wirkt durch ihn die Werke des Glaubens und Gehorsams.

Freilich ist auch dies alles wieder verborgen unter tausend Hüllen. Weiß doch kein Mensch vom andern, ob er wahrhaft glaubt. Und kann doch keiner auch nur bei sich selber das Vorhandensein des Glaubens als eines Besitzes feststellen [?]. Der Glaube ist kein Zustand, sondern eine immer wieder neu zu vollziehende Tat, in welcher die Anfechtung des Unglaubens überwunden wird, und man sich dem Erbarmen Christi ausliefern, um selber von gleichem Erbarmen gegen seinen Nächsten erfüllt zu werden. Der Glaube troht gegenüber den berechtigten Anklagen seines Gewissens auf die Vergebung, die Christus zugesagt hat, und nimmt immer neu den Kampf des Geistes mit dem Fleische auf, den Kampf, in welchem sich das christliche Leben abspielt. Darum darf aber auch die Predigt und das Hören der Predigt nicht aufhören, weil das Wort allein die Unterscheidung zwischen Gesetz und Evangelium, Rose und Christus, Unglauben und Glauben, Fleisch und Geist uns lehrt, zu diesem Kampf aufruft und uns stärkt. Luther warnt darum vor nichts mehr als vor dem Überdruss an Gottes Wort, daß man meint, man wisse schon alles. „Nichts ist schädlicher, als wenn man sich vermisst und sich träumen läßt, man glaube und verstehe das Evangelium wohl.“ „Lieber Gott, wenn wir gleich helle und gewisse Sprüche der Schrift für uns haben, gibt es dennoch Mühe und Arbeit, daß wir vor dem Teufel bleiben.“ So lehrt die Anfechtung aufs Wort merken und immer flehentlich um den Heiligen Geist bitten.

Daz recht gehört wird, beweist sich darin, daß das gehörte Wort Frucht schafft. Wer erfaßt worden ist von der Bewegung der Barmherzigkeit Gottes, die nach uns greift durch die Christusbotschaft, der muß auch seinem Nächsten „ein Christus werden“. Da er die guten Werke nicht mehr für sich selber braucht, um auf den Wegen des Gesetzes sich Verdienste zu sammeln, ist er nun mit seinem Wirken ganz frei für den Nächsten. Weil ihm Barmherzigkeit widerfahren ist, muß er selber barmherzig werden; weil ihm Vergebung zuteil wurde, will er auch vergeben; weil er zuerst geliebt worden ist, ist er selber zum Lieben berufen.... In den geringsten seiner Brüder erhält der Christus die Liebe zurück, die er uns in dem Dienst seines Lebens entgegentrug. Damit lehrt die Liebesbewegung Gottes zu ihrem Ursprung zurück. Und darin rundet sich der Kreis der Voraussetzungen, die für Luthers Verständnis der Predigt wirksam gewesen sind und sein eigenes Predigen kennzeichnen.



King Henry VIII Courts Luther.

When the Bund of Schmalkalden was formed in 1531, Philip of Hessen tried to get the king of England to join.

In January, 1532, Paget and Cranmer were sent to assure the Lutheran princes, Henry and Francis I would help them against the kaiser. They, however, helped the kaiser against the Turk.

At Nuernberg Cranmer married Osiander's niece Margaret. In August he was called home to be made Archbishop of Canterbury. For this he had to thank Queen Anne Boleyn, as Henry said.

Early in 1533 Henry would not join the Bund unless the German cities also did so. Later Christopher Mont, L. L. D. of Koeln, naturalized in England since 1531, and Vaughan had no success, for Henry was hurting Christian III of Denmark by helping Luebeck. In 1534 Legh, Paget, Heath, and Mont also failed.

On March 11, 1535, Dr. Barnes, "the king's chaplain and professor of theology," was again in Wittenberg, "treating only of the second marriage of the king," and trying very hard to get Melanchthon to go to England. Of course, he did not win the Lutherans to approve of the divorce. Encouraged by "Doctor Antonius, my good friend," Melanchthon lettered the king. After a lengthened and fulsome eulogy he advises "a sure and simple form of doctrine" and to have a care that "cruelty be not used against the good."

To this letter Archbishop Laurence attributes the *Articles of Faith* published during Henry's reign.

On June 4 Bishop Edward Fox of Hereford wrote Cromwell that George Joy was lodging with him at Calais.

On the return of Barnes he was again returned to Wittenberg in great haste to keep Melanchthon from going to France, the credence being dated July 8.

In August Barnes got Melanchthon to dedicate the second edition of his *Loci*, an explanation of Paul's Letter to the Romans, to Henry, not as a patron, but as a censor, and asked him to study and criticize the book! For this dedication Philip had to defend himself the next year. The work was taken to England by Alesius, whom John Stigilius "pursued with an elegy."

On July 11, 1535, Chapuys tells Karl if the traitors "loitered longer, the modern preachers and prelates would corrupt the people, and all would be lost" — to the Pope. Again, on September 25: The Catholic religion is going daily to destruction. Lord Hussey could remain no longer in a country where all ranks and classes were being driven into heresy.

In September, 1535, Vaughan gets the king's "hertie and condigne thankes" for good service in Germany and 5,000 pounds to spend in Denmark.

The spread of Lutheranism was creating more exasperation than even the divorce. The heretical preachers were more violent than ever, and the king was believed to have encouraged them. Dr. Brown, an Augustinian friar and General of the Mendicant Order, who, as some believed, had married Henry and Anne, preached the bishops' "sacred chrism would avail them nothing while they obeyed the idol of Rome, who was a limb of the devil."

The Kaiser "saw that the intellect and energy of England was running upon the German lines. . . . The King himself, if he wished it, might not be able to check the torrent, and the opinion of his vassals and his own imperious disposition might carry him to the extreme lengths of Luther."

On the 30th Pope Paul III thundered forth his curse of excommunication against Henry, who now surely needed the help of the German Lutherans more than ever.

On September 11 Dean Luther presided at a disputation when Jerome Weller and Nicholas Medler were to be made doctors of divinity. The promotion took place on the 14th under Cruciger, Justus Jonas being the promoter. On account of the plague the university had been sent to Jena, but Melanchthon, Cruciger, Myconius, and Menius came over for the ceremony. In addition, there were present Bugenhagen, Amsdorf, Roerer, Hausmann, Jerome, and Augustine Schurf, and of course the ambassador from England, Dr. Robert Barnes.

In honor of her house-friend Weller, Kate Luther cooked the "splendid banquet," for which Jonas had to get all kinds of fowl from Jena and Luther begged the Elector to send venison from his residence at Lochau. The guests filled seven or eight tables.

Next day Luther, Jonas, Cruciger, and Bugenhagen wrote the Elector to grant a private audience to the English ambassador.

On the 18th Barnes found the Elector at Jena starting to visit King Ferdinand at Vienna and received permission to confer with the Wittenbergers and a promise to have Henry's proposals considered by the Bund of Schmalkalden, to be called in special session in December. On the same day John Frederick also wrote King Henry, urging him to keep on reforming the Church, such zeal being the best sacrifice wherewith he could serve God, the whole Church, and all posterity.

"That black Englishman," as Luther calls Barnes, was again in Wittenberg and on October 5 wrote Cromwell that Luther was writing against certain articles spread by King Francis as coming from Luther, Melanchthon, and Bugenhagen. On the 6th Barnes reported that there is a great preparing for Master Almener, the English agent, at the Elector's own castle; that the Elector was very glad to have King Henry in the Smalcald League and straightway called

a special meeting for December 6 to consider the admission of England as an ally; that "Langius shal come in al haste to feche phylpe" into "franse, but I have stopyd yt, and by god's grace (yf he and I do lyve) I shal bryng hym with me" into England; "I must have money plenty to pay for phylps costs and all others that he shal bryng wyth hym and to by hym horse and other necessaryse for hys journey."

On Sunday, November 7, Peter Paul Vergerio, the Pope's nuncio, invited Luther and Barnes to the castle. Though the Englishman did not accept, Luther with his characteristic speeches acted as the spokesman for Barnes also, as the Reformer informed Justus Jonas.

On the 15th Barnes left Jena for Leipzig to dispute with Cochlaeus, who had bitterly attacked King Henry for killing Bishop John Fisher and Chancellor Thomas More — canonized in 1935.

On December 9 Bishop Edward Fox of Hereford, Archdeacon Nicholas Heath, and Dr. Barnes conferred with the Elector at Weimar, went with him to Schmalkalden, arrived on the 13th, and delivered the King's message to the Saxon chancellors, Brueck and Burkhardt (Burkhardt, Burkhard).

On December 21 Vergerio was told the Bund would have nothing to do with the Pope's Council.

William du Bellay made a brilliant speech for France, but on the 22d the Bund declined to take in King Francis, and du Bellay left soon after.

On the 24th Bishop Fox addressed the Bund for the "head of the Church of England," who would fight for the Christian religion with land and people, his riches and all his war power. He admonished them to unity, warned them against the Anabaptists, discussed the papal pretensions, and insisted on unity of doctrine before entering the Council at last called by the Pope to meet at Mantua on May 23, 1537.

The good Germans rejoiced over Henry's readiness to agree with them in doctrine and on December 25 signed an agreement with the Englishmen to admit their king as the patron and protector of the Bund if he would further the pure Gospel according to the *Augsburg Confession* and the *Apology* and give 100,000 crowns to defend their faith.

Mont took this petition of thirteen articles to the King. Barnes set out for Wittenberg and on the 28th, from Gotha, wrote jubilantly to Cromwell about the success of Fox and paid him a handsome compliment. As to the divorce, he thinks Martin is more favorable than before; Jonas does not object; Philip seems to be with us; Pomeranus alone resists savagely. "Remember us with more money.... I have here at my charge to the kinges honore V horse."

Barnes "adopts a secular habit." The news does not startle us

a little bit, but in those days it was so important that Ambassador Chapuys dispatches it to Kaiser Karl V. Another proof of the man's importance — "sent like an ambassador with ten horse unto the Duke of Saxony, elector, in the matters of the Gospel," and then the learned Bishop of Winchester indulges in the silly sneer that Luther's religion permits a man to travel with ten horses. But Gardiner's religion let him travel with ten times ten horses, "all in gray velvet with gold chains on their necks." And in 1520 Wolsey's religion let him surpass the lavish splendor of the King on the Field of Cloth of Gold, and in 1527 it let him travel to France with 900 horses at the cost of about \$500,000.

Bishop Fox had William Turner for secretary, and Thomas Theobald was with Archdeacon Heath. On January 1 they came to Wittenberg, came in royal state, came with forty horses, befitting the great kingdom of England. Wittenberg had never seen the like.

The English offered to pay their own way, which was declined by the Elector. The expense was very heavy, quite true; but then the winning of England for the Gospel was at stake — and the winning of an ally against the Kaiser.

"Luther lovingly embraces them and is even delighted by their courtesy," writes Melanchthon. Luther jokes about the importance attached to him by the King of England. After eleven universities have already given their decision, it seems the world will be lost "unless we poor beggars, the Wittenberg theologians, be heard."

Bishop Fox brought a letter of thanks, dated October 1, from the King to his "very beloved friend" Melanchthon for his book on Romans, than which nothing could have more pleased the King and which everybody ought to prize highly for its merits; also three or five hundred crowns.

There were also fifty gulden for Luther.

Are we awake? We rub our eyes. Yes, there it is, black on white, fifty gulden from the Anglo-Saxon king, Defender of the Faith, to the Saxon monk, Destroyer of the Faith.

The English also brought a book by Dr. Richard Sampson, Henry's dean of the chapel, on the king's supremacy, and a volume of sermons to show how evangelical the King was, who also felt called on to admonish the Lutherans to remain firm against the Antichrist, to whom Henry now would grant no primacy at all, not even of human right. The visitors freely complained of the tyranny of their king and admired the freedom of the German theologians. Barnes told more good of Henry than Luther could readily believe and admitted, "My king does not care for religion," and the others added, "Our king is inconstant."

For about two months the divorce was discussed. On January 19 Luther wrote Chancellor Caspar Mueller at Mansfeld the Pope treated

King Henry so badly, "that I must almost excuse the King's person and still cannot sanction the matter"—of the divorce.

On the same day he wrote Barnes and grieved over the death of Catherine of Aragon on the 7th, forsaken by all but "the poor beggars, the theologians of Wittenberg; gladly would we have kept her and her daughter in their royal honors." When knighthood was in flower!

On January 25 Luther thanks the Elector for a gift of wine and a wild boar. "I had hopes we'd be rid of the English embassy in three days, but they do not think of leaving for a long time." He had done greater and more things in four weeks; in the way they act, they will not finish this one thing in twelve years' quarreling. And the great cost to the Elector is unbearable.

Replying to the invitation to head the Bund, Henry on March 12 declared no religious union could be had without milding the *Augsburg Confession* and the *Apology*. He also asked, if he were attacked, that the Bund furnish him with 500 horse or with ten ships of war at their own cost for four months and 2,000 horse and 5,000 foot at his expense.

On January 11 Luther had written the Elector John Frederick upholding his verdict against the divorce; in other matters, however, he will not show himself unfriendly in order they may not think we Germans are stone and wood.

The doctrines were discussed on the basis of the *Augsburg Confession* and the *Apology*. Melanchthon complained to Camerarius about the quibbling of the English—"They exercise me so that I can hardly breathe. Archdeacon Nicholas Heath is the only one of our guests who is distinguished by culture and learning. The rest are destitute of our philosophy and sweetness; so I avoid their society as much as I can." Luther, on the other hand, liked his fellow-Augustinian Dr. Barnes and praised his uprightness.

A fine illustration of the friendly intercourse of Barnes with the Wittenbergers, also Melanchthon, is given by Paul Eber's letter to the Bremen theologian Hardenberg.

Luther could not hide his surprise at his visitors' confidence in the justice of the divorce. He listened patiently to their arguments and was anything but "stone and wood." Indeed, we are truly amazed to see how far the peace-loving Luther could go to have peace and union with England. "It is indeed true that we ought to have patience, though everything in England cannot so suddenly be put into practise according to the doctrine (as it also has not been done among us)," he wrote on April 20 to Vice-Chancellor Burkhardt, who translated the *Wittenberg Articles*, of 1536, as the doctrinal agreement is known, penned by Melanchthon.

On January 14 there was a disputation on justification, not with

the English, but for them. For their special benefit Luther pointedly and repeatedly denied faith itself is a good work.

Before the coming of the English it was rumored they would most firmly defend private Masses. And so Luther as early as October prepared theses for a disputation "Against the Private Mass," which was held on the 29th. Luther spoke of the right manner in which princes were to get "private Mass" from their chaplains, no doubt with a side glance at Barnes, who had been made Henry's chaplain. Bishop Fox quoted a Bible-verse in support of Luther's position. Other speakers were Bugenhagen, Cruciger, Jonas, Weller, Vice-Chancellor Burkhard, and Melanchthon, specially called from Jena at the very urgent request of the English. They insisted his presence had been promised.

Speaking to old Chancellor Brueck, Fox was quite sure King Henry would accept the Lutheran teaching in all points. Luther spoke his doubts: his eyes were fitted with Roentgen rays.

The Englishmen wished to take Melanchthon to England and, failing in that, thought of Prince George of Anhalt.

They left on April 10; on the 25th Fox and Heath were at the meeting at Regensburg. Writing to the Elector in May, Fox signed himself "Your Electoral Highness's good friend." Strype writes the Germans thought this "without that sense of distance and good manners that became him." On July 4 Fox was in London. They had with them Luther's polite letter to Cromwell and the judgment against Henry's divorce.

In June, 1540, Luther makes the startling statement "The word would have brought me 300 fl., but I did not want to." Did they try to bribe him for the divorce?

Luther's position on the divorce of course offended Henry and at the same time endangered Anne Boleyn, the most powerful protector of the Lutherans in England. Not even for the great prize of winning England would Luther wound his conscience. When knighthood was in flower!

Barnes left Wittenberg before April 10 and in May asked Cromwell for the Mastership of the House of Our Lady of Bethlehem, now Bedlam, held till now by Queen Anne's brother George.

Barnes used the stay at Wittenberg to print his *Lives of the Popes*, dedicated to King Henry. The material was taken from Platina and other papal historians. In the introduction Luther writes: "In the beginning, not being much versed in history, I attacked the Pope *a priori*, *i. e.*, from the Holy Scriptures. Now I am wonderfully delighted that others are doing the same *a posteriori*, *i. e.*, from history. And I think I am triumphing, since, as the light appears, I understand that the histories agree with the Scriptures. For what I have learned from St. Paul and Daniel as teachers, that

the Pope is the adversary of God and of all, this history indicates with its very finger, pointing out not merely genus and species, but the very individual."

Fueter says: "Protestant historiography has received its program from the hand of Luther himself. Its first work appeared under the eyes of the Reformer at Wittenberg and with a preface by him."

In 1545 Luther wrote an introduction to *Papal Fidelity of Hadrian IV and Alexander III shown to Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossa*. This booklet is a literal translation of part of Barnes's *Lives*, the translation and notes likely by Luther himself.

In May, 1536, Henry beheaded George Boleyn for incest with Anne, a few months before the birth of Elizabeth!! With his dying breath he declared his innocence. A convinced Lutheran, he said to the people, "I desire you to help to the setting forth of the true Word of God." On May 19, 1536, Henry beheaded his Queen Anne, to the end declaring her innocence.

Melanchthon wrote, "More accused than convicted of adultery." Cardinal Campegi also testified to her innocence. Queen Mary of Hungary, now regent of the Netherlands, wrote her brother Ferdinand of Austria, "People say Henry trumped up the charge to get rid of her." At her death Anne called herself a Lutheran. Froude says, "She had been conspicuously Lutheran; her family and her party were Lutheran." Bishop Aylmer asks: "Was not Quene Anne . . . the chief, first, and only cause of banyshing the beast of Rome with all his beggarly baggage? Was there ever in England a greater feate wrought by any man then this was by a woman? . . . Wherefore though many deserved muche praise for the helping forwarde of it, yet the cropp and roote was the Quene, whiche God hath endewed with wisdome that she coulde, and gyven hir the minde that she would do it."

In June Barnes warned Melanchthon not to come to England in spite of Henry's earnest and repeated invitations.

Coverdale's translation of the Bible of course did not please all, and hot debates were held in the convocation begun June 9, 1536, at St. Paul's with Hugh Latimer's stinging sermon on "The Unjust Steward." Alesius gives a vivid account of one of the sessions.

"At the King's pleasure all the learned men, but especially the bishops, assembled, to whom this matter seemed chiefly to belong. . . . The bishops and prelates attending upon the coming of Cromwell, as he was come in, rose up and did obeisance unto him as their vicar-general, and he again saluted every one in their degree and sat down in the highest place at the table, according to his degree and office. . . . Thereupon Cromwell opened the discussion by sketching in a short speech the King's purpose and commands. He will not, he said,

'admit any articles or doctrine not contained in the Scripture, but approved only by continuance of time and old custom and by un-written verities, as ye were wont to do. . . . His Majesty will give you high thanks if ye will set and conclude a godly and a perfect unity, whereunto this is the only way and mean, if ye will determine all things by the Scripture, as God commandeth you in Deuteronomy; which things His majesty exhorted and desireth you to do.'

"The bishops rose up altogether, giving thanks unto the King's Majesty . . . for his mostly godly exhortation."

Alesius, at the invitation of Cromwell, explained the meaning of the word "sacrament." Stokesley, Bishop of London, interrupted him as he was looking up the Fathers and was in turn checked by Edward Fox, Bishop of Hereford, who had on July 4 returned from his conference with Luther at Wittenberg. He reminded both that they were commanded by the King that these controversies should be determined by the rule and judgment of the Scriptures.

He said to Alesius: "Brother Alexander, contend not so much about the mind and sayings of the doctors and school-writers, for ye know that they in many places do differ among themselves and that they are contrary to themselves in almost every article. And there is no hope of any concord if we must lean to their judgment in matters of controversy." Then, specially addressing the bishops: "Think not that we can by any sophistical subtleties steal out of the world against the light which every one doth see. Christ hath so lightened the world at this time that the light of the Gospel hath put to flight all misty darkness, and it will shortly have the higher hand of all clouds, though we resist in vain ever so much."

"The lay people do now know the Holy Scriptures better than many of us, and the Germans have made the text of the Bible so plain and easy by the Hebrew and Greek tongues that now many things may be better understood without any glosses at all than by all the commentaries of the doctors. And, moreover, they have so opened these controversies by their writings that women and children may wonder at the blindness and falsehood that have been hitherto. [This in reply to Bishop Stokesley's sneer at the Word of God, which every cobbler was now reading in his mother tongue.] Truth is the daughter of time, and time is the mother of truth; and whatsoever is besieged of truth cannot long continue; and upon whose side truth doth stand, that ought not to be thought transitory or that it will ever fall."

Hard pressed in the argument, Stokesley replied to Alesius with great heat: "Ye are far deceived if ye think that there is none other Word of God than which every souter and cobbler doth read in their mother tongue. And if ye think that nothing pertaineth unto the Christian faith but that only that is written in the Bible, then err ye plainly with the Lutherans."

"Now, when the right noble Lord Cromwell, the archbishop, with the other bishops who did defend the pure doctrine of the Gospel, heard this, they smiled a little one upon another, forasmuch as they saw him flee even in the very beginning of the disputation unto his old rusty sophistry and unwritten verities.

"Thus through the industry of Cromwell the colloquies were brought to this end, that, albeit religion could not wholly be reformed, yet at that time there was some reformation had throughout all England."

The Wittenberg Articles, of 1536, called by Seckendorf a "repetition and explanation of the Augsburg Confession," were not adopted; Gardiner supplied the political reasons against them. But for these political reasons England would likely have become Lutheran in 1536.

Even as it was, they had considerable influence on the *Book of Six Articles of Faith and Ceremonies* presented by Bishop Fox to Convocation on July 11. On the 31st Alesius through Aepinus sent a translation to Germany. "A most confused composition," commented Melanchthon.

It was said in convocation there were sixty-seven Lutheran errors current in England. Fuller calls them "the Protestant religion in ore." We have read it had even been proposed in Parliament to adopt the *Augsburg Confession*.

The Wittenberg Articles, of 1536, had also an influence on *The Institution of a Christian Man*, of 1537, the Bishops' Book, with a preface by Bishop Fox of Hereford. Froude calls this book "in point of language beyond all question the most beautiful composition that had yet appeared in the English language."

In May, 1543, Henry revised the Bishops' Book and called it *A Necessary Doctrine of Erudition for Any Christian Man, the King's Book*. Of it Gardiner wrote, "The king's majesty hath, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, composed all matters of religion."

Richard Taverner, one of the "Lutheran" students at Wolsey's Cardinal College at Oxford, who suffered persecution for his faith, was a layman and a lawyer and good in Greek, even wont "to quote the law in Greek." Cromwell got Henry to give him a clerkship. In 1536 appeared *The Confessyon of the Fayth of the Germaynes, exhibited to the Most Victorious Emperour Charles the V., at Augusta, the yere of our Lord, 1530. To which is added the Apologie of Melancthon, who defendeth with Reasons invincible the aforesayd Confessyon, translated by Richard Taverner, at the commandment of his Master, the ryght honourable Master Thomas Cromwell, chefe secretaire to the Kynges Graces*. London, Robert Redman.

At the same time came out *A compendious letter which John Pomerane—curate of the congregacion of Wittenberge sent to the*

faithfull christen congregacion in England. London, Richard Charlton.

The King's own printer published Tyndale's "Luther's New Testament in English."

Lucy told Cromwell a priest declared, "Ember days were named after one Luther, a paramour of a certain bishop of Rome."

When Jacob Schenk and Philip Moth were made Licentiates of Theology, on October 10, 1536, Luther presided at the disputation "On the Power of the Council," which Paul III on June 4 had called to Mantua for May 23, 1537. Dr. Barnes took part in the debate. Perhaps it was for the "honorable guests" that the city council sent eight cans of Rhine wine for the banquet at the Black Cloister, Luther's house.

Stephen Gardiner sent Henry Phillips and Gabriel Donne to arrest William Tyndale, the translator of the New Testament. In May, 1535, they had him in the great state prison of Vilvorde, near Brussels. With the King's consent Cromwell wrote Archbishop Carondelet and the marquis of Bergen. Thomas Poynts of the "English House" at Antwerp delivered the letters. Stephen Vaughan also made strenuous efforts to save the reformer. In vain. On October 6, 1536, he was strangled and burned — which he had long looked for. His last word was, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes!"

W.M. DALLMANN.

The Greatness of Luther's Commentary on Galatians.

If some theologians and historians declare to have been disappointed with Luther's Galatians, it is because they looked for a commentary more learned and critical than popular.*⁴) It was not intended to be a critical study in the present philological sense of the term. Nor does the work hold out the slightest shred of comfort to the Modernist. During the stormy years that gave birth to this commentary Luther had too much practical work of prior importance on his hands to find leisure for comparative and critical exegesis.

It still remains a marvel how he could pen a commentary so diffuse and yet so simple. Its thought- and sermon-stimulating properties are immense. It is not so much a commentary which deals with every iota of the original — although sincere exposition is by no means neglected — as a course of lectures on the chief Christian doctrine, justification by faith, and as set forth in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. There lies the reason why the commentary

*⁴) Cp., e.g., Fife, *Young Luther*, pp. 214 ff.

has become such a tremendous spiritual force to all who came into devout and studious contact with it.

Martin Bucer (1491—1551), although often unionistically inclined and lacking that courage of conviction and confession which characterized Luther, was nevertheless a man of profound learning. Cranmer called him to England to further the cause of the Reformation there. Enjoying the freer spirit of the British Isles, Bucer stayed in England until his dying day, holding a professorship at Cambridge University. On receiving and reading a copy of Luther's Galatians, he jubilantly wrote to Spalatin: "Luther, by the divine lucubrations which he hath published, stands so high in my opinion that I look to him as an angelic guide in the interpretation of difficult passages of Scripture. How, then, think you, did I rejoice when one of our brethren brought me his commentary on the Galatians! After only a very slight perusal of it I felt like dancing for joy." (As reported by Milner, *History of the Church*, 1812.)

It is well known that the commentary indelibly impressed its benign influence upon the immortal dreamer of Bedford jail. Speaking of the conflicts of his soul, Bunyan writes:—

"I did greatly long to see some ancient godly man's experience who had writ some hundreds of years before I was born. Well, after such longings in my mind, the God in whose hands are all our days and ways did cast into my hand one day a book of Martin Luther; it was his comment on the Galatians, . . . the which when I had but a little way perused, I found my condition in his experience so largely and profoundly handled as if this book had been written out of my heart. This made me marvel; for, thus thought I, this man could not know anything of the state of Christians now, but must needs write and speak the experience of former days. Besides, he doeth most gravely in that book debate of the rise of these temptations, namely, blasphemy, desperation, and the like, showing that the Law of Moses as well as the devil, death, and hell hath a very great hand therein, the which at first was very strange to me; but considering and watching, I found it so indeed. But of particulars here I intend nothing; only this methinks I must let fall before all men, I do prefer this book of Martin Luther upon Galatians (excepting the Holy Bible) before all the books that ever I have seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience."

Indeed, the author of *Pilgrim's Progress* read this book on Galatians well, and he certainly got the point. Like the poor, so wounded consciences are always with us and always have been. Little wonder, then, that the book was read with so great an avidity immediately after its first publication and became so instrumental in promoting the glorious, soul-liberating cause of the Reformation.

This gives Luther's monumental work a superior claim to the

attention of the historian. It became one of the most powerful means of reviving the light of Scripture in the sixteenth century. Furthermore, it will in all ages be capable of doing the same, under the blessing of God, whenever men regard the oracles of divine truth and whenever souls shall be distressed with a sense of indwelling sin and guilt.

Canon Hare (1795—1855), chaplain in ordinary to the Queen, in 1839 preached a remarkable series of sermons, "In Vindication of Luther." Then, now nearly a hundred years ago, he said: "Not till the world's course has run out, will it be known to how many persons this commentary on the Galatians has been a blessed well-spring of spiritual light and consolation."

Archbishop Richard Trench (1807—1886) of Dublin, dean of Westminster, professor of New Testament exegesis at Cambridge, poet and scholar, did not overstate when he claimed that "Luther has done more to bring out the innermost spirit of St. Paul's writings than all other critics put together."

These are strong, but not too strong words of theologians outside the Lutheran communion. It is doubtful whether Luther's commentary will be relished at all by any but serious, humble, and contrite spirits. They are the only people in the world to whom the all-important article of justification will appear worthy of all acceptance.

The article of justification by faith we rightly hold to be that article by which the Christian Church stands or falls. It is the acid test, the true criterion, and "the only solid rock," as Luther describes it in the preface to his commentary.

Faith alone justifies. This divine truth gave direction to all of Luther's labors in the epistle of St. Paul's. Yet this master in the Scriptures warns that faith never excludes good works. Lest sinful man make his new-found liberty in Christ a cloak for malice, Luther, following Paul meticulously, is very careful to explain that true faith is also infallibly connected with a spirit of true benevolence, the spirit of benevolence, or love, which regards the Law as a rule, but that the kingdom of God is attained not through the Law, or the works of the Law, but by faith. Everything is to be ascribed to faith, so that all our sufficiency is of God, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift.

The points of doctrine "which ought to be explained to the people" Luther finds laid down by the apostle in this order: Let a man first learn to despair of his own strength; let him hear the word of evangelical faith; hearing, let him believe it; believing, let him call upon God; calling upon Him, let him find, as he will, that he is being heard; being heard of God, let him receive the spirit of love; receiving this spirit, let him walk in the same and not fulfil

the lusts of the flesh, but let him crucify them; lastly, being crucified with Christ, let him rise from the dead and possess the kingdom of heaven.

This is the most masterful treatise on the difference and correlation between works and faith ever set down. Here is a practical manual of faith and works, valuable to layman and theologian alike. For has not this apparent contradiction between faith and works always been a bone of contention and cause of confusion to men of finite minds? But his clear delineation of the rise and progress of Christian faith and life in this epistle obviously shows that Luther fully understood the apostle's meaning. As a matter of fact, Luther was *the man of God* to write such a commentary on such an epistle of faith as the Galatians.

The great Reformer himself had plowed deep into the human heart. He well knew its native depravity. He had long labored to no purpose to gain peace of conscience by legal observances and moral works. He had counted himself among the "pious and just monks" and declared in 1533 that, if any son of the cloister could have earned salvation from the monastic profession, it would have been he. When his father feared that he might not be able to keep his vows, Luther shows himself "unpricked by conscience for any failure of this kind." In the commentary itself he declares: "Outwardly I lived good, just, and poor and cared nothing for the world." But it was the God-directed discovery that the just shall live by his faith that relieved him from his "most pungent anxiety." It was appointed in the eternal and mysterious counsels of the Godhead that Luther should teach mankind this great evangelical tenet after upwards of a thousand years of public obscurity. The angel with the everlasting Gospel was on the way.

Through the entire commentary the author proves from the inspired apostle that in justification before God all sorts of human works are excluded, moral as well as ceremonial. Men are declared righteous before God not because of what *they* have done or can or will do, but because of what Christ has done *for them*. Luther in his masterly exposition restored to the Christian world the true forensic sense of the term "justification" and rescued it from an erroneous sense in which it had been used for many ages, as though meaning "habits of virtue poured into the Christian (*gratia infusa*)," thus confounding justification with sanctification.

Luther, the incomparable theologian, once for all times here settled the true bonds and limits of the Law and the Gospel and clearly distinguished between being accepted by God and personal holiness. He is a doctor of the Scriptures indeed. To be accepted with God, he shows, is a free gift received through Christ alone by faith in the heart of the humbled sinner, whose pardon and reconciliation with

God is complete by His Son. Personal holiness remains imperfect in this life and perfection is sincerely pressed after, and such pressing after is delighted in. By this doctrine a new light breaks on the mind, and Christianity appears singularly distinct not only from popery, but also from all other religions.

Thus, throughout the commentary the observant reader will note Luther's clear-cut progress of thought by his running comments on each chapter and verse of this Pauline epistle. He begins with the basis of proper exposition and at the outset lays down what constitutes sound principles of interpretation. Then he launches full force into the theme of the book: justification by faith alone. This *sola fide* he carries out by numerous instances and examples, always most closely following his divinely inspired preceptor Paul. Then at the end of the book he beholds the new creature. Properly, and Scripturally, sanctification follows upon justification; the new man follows the new birth.

After a careful and continued study of Luther's commentary on Galatians of 1535 any one who at all ruefully realizes his need of a Savior will most heartily concur with Dr. Staupitz when he said to Friar Martin before the Reformation had actually begun:—

“I like the doctrine you preach exceedingly. It gives the glory and everything else to God alone and nothing to man. Now it is clearer than the day that it is impossible to ascribe too much glory, goodness, and mercy to God.”

Fort McArthur, Cal.

R. T. DU BRAU.

Über Bücherbesprechungen.

Jede Nummer unserer Zeitschrift enthält acht Seiten Bücherbesprechungen, und manchmal geben wir noch zwei Seiten zu. Es dürfte unsern Lesern nicht unlieb sein, wenn wir einmal ein Wort über die Absicht und den Nutzen solcher Bücheranzeigen sagen. Nach unserer Überzeugung haben diese Rezensionen einen dreifachen Zweck. Einmal wollen sie unsere Leser einigermaßen auf dem laufenden erhalten darüber, was in der theologischen Welt Amerikas und Europas vor sich geht, und wie sich dies in den neuerscheinenden Büchern zeigt. Zur theologischen Weiterarbeit des Pfarrers gehört eben auch dies, daß er orientiert ist und bleibt über den theologischen Betrieb seiner Zeit, auch wenn er keins der angezeigten Bücher kaufen oder lesen kann. Deshalb ist ein zweiter Zweck solcher Bücheranzeigen, nicht bloß einen, wenn auch noch so knappen, Einblick in den Inhalt des betreffenden Buchs zu gewähren, sondern zugleich in Verbindung mit der Besprechung dies oder jenes zur Sprache zu bringen, was direkt der Erweiterung der theologischen Kenntnisse dient. Eine Rezension, wie wir sie auffassen, ist zugleich ein Nagel, an dem man noch etwas anderes hängen kann und soll, damit auch die Anzeige eines vielleicht völlig abzulehnenden Werkes doch fruchtbringend sei. Deshalb haben wir hin und wieder auch ein bedeutendes Werk, das uns nicht zu Rezensionszwecken zuging, gelauft, entweder zum vollen oder

zu dem von dem Verleger angebotenen ermäßigten Preis, und es dann besprochen. Endlich aber findet sich unter den Lesern dieser Zeitschrift manch einer, der recht bedenkt, daß man auch theologisch nicht recht arbeiten kann ohne Werkzeug und daß deshalb jeder Pastor darauf bedacht sein sollte, in den Besitz des nötigen Handwerkszugs zu kommen und, wenn besonders gute Werkzeuge hergestellt werden, diese sich auch anzuschaffen. Unsere theologischen Werkzeuge sind die Bücher, besonders solche Bücher, mit denen wir recht in unser lebenslängliches Lehrbuch, die heilige Schrift, und in die daraus geschöpfte christliche Lehre eindringen können, und solche, die uns unsere Zeit recht verstehen lehren oder uns Anweisung geben zur praktischen Ausrichtung unsers Amtes. Deshalb dürfte man sich auch beim Bücherkaufen immer etwas nach den Rezensionen in unsern Zeitschriften richten; und weil so oft die Mittel fehlen, sich ein Buch anzuschaffen, sollte man dahin wirken, daß ein gewisses Buch von der öffentlichen Bibliothek der betreffenden Stadt angeschafft wird. Diese Weise haben wir selbst schon mehr als einmal befolgt und bei den Bibliothekaren in der Regel freundliches Entgegenkommen gefunden.

Die Rezensionen, die in unserer Zeitschrift erscheinen, sind manchmal kürzer, manchmal länger, und dies muß dem einzelnen Rezensenten überlassen bleiben. Aber wieviel man aus einer ausführlichen Rezension lernen kann, wird jeder Leser erkennen, wenn er zum Beispiel die Besprechung des Buches von dem vielgenannten Stanley Jones in der Aprilnummer, S. 313, liest oder die Ausführungen über eine Reihe neuerer Schriften, die sich im Dezemberheft des vorigen Jahrgangs, S. 881, finden.

Wird nun aber auch der Zweck solcher Rezensionen erreicht? Wir könnten dies mit einer ganzen Anzahl mündlicher und schriftlicher Aussagen belegen, wollen jedoch nur einige anführen. Wir machen immer wieder die Erfahrung, daß ein Stück Wahrheit in dem paradoxaen Wort liegt, daß der bekannte Hebraist, Ereget und Talmudforscher H. L. Strak in seinen Schülertagen von dem später nach Amerika gekommenen, dann hier in St. Louis wirkenden und schließlich zur katholischen Kirche abgesallenen Eduard Preuß gehört hat: „Die Weisheit besteht in Büchertiteln.“¹⁾ Darum sagte auch kürzlich ein hervorragender Pädagog unsers Landes auf einer großen, von etwa 6,000 Schulmännern unsers Landes besuchten Versammlung hier in St. Louis: „Knowing where to find information is a part of education.“

So schrieb uns im Oktober letzten Jahres einer unserer Pastoren aus dem Osten: „Schon seit vier Jahren habe ich täglich mein griechisches Neues Testament gelesen. In jüngster Zeit habe ich mich mit Conybear and Stodd's Selections from the Septuagint befaßt. Sie können sich denken, wie sehr mich Ihre Rezension der Rahlf'schen 'Septuaginta' (VI, 873) interessierte.“ Er und andere haben sich dieses prächtige Werk seitdem angeschafft. Vor etwa zehn Jahren wurde in „Lehre und Wehe“ das Werk Heinrich Böhmers „Der junge Luther“ angezeigt.²⁾ Bald darauf schrieb mir ein älterer Großstadtpastor: „Vor einigen Tagen erhielt ich von Deutschland Dr. Böhmers 'Der junge Luther'. Ich stimme Deinem Urteil über dieses Werk durchaus bei. Ich kann mich kaum vom Lesen dieses Werks wegreißen, so nimmt es mein Interesse in Anspruch. In vieler Hinsicht ist es das Beste, was ich über Luther bisher gelesen habe, und ich habe nicht wenig über ihn

1) Zimmer, „Bücherkleinode evangelischer Theologen“, S. 163. Dieses Werk enthält lauter Ausprüche von angesehenen Theologen der Neuzeit über Werke, die ihnen besonders wichtig und wertvoll geworden sind.

2) 72, 306.

gelesen. Nie hatte ich vorher eine so genaue Darstellung des Verlaufs des Ablässtreites gelesen. Erst aus Böhmers Werk habe ich den alten Kurfürsten recht kennengelernt und auch jenen Karl von Miltitz."

Ein anderer, jüngerer Pastor aus einem der Mittelstaaten, der fleißig weiterstudiert, sich nach und nach eine sorgfältig ausgewählte, gute Bibliothek anschafft und von uns die Biographie des blinden Theologen Eduard Riggensbach von Schlitter³⁾ geborgt hatte, schrieb: "Under separate cover I am returning Edward Riggensbach, which arrived a few days ago. The biography was so absorbing that I could not lay it aside. Would to God that all the brethren in the ministry of our Synod would devote themselves to the study of the Bible with the zeal of Riggensbach."

Ein älterer Pastor unserer Synode hat ebenfalls diese lehrreiche und interessante Biographie gelesen. Als er uns das Werk zurückgab, schrieb er dazu: "Das Buch ist mir aus Herz gewachsen und hat einen tiefen Eindruck auf mich gemacht. Riggensbach ist in meinen Augen ein Wunder Gottes. Schade, daß er nicht zur vollen Wahrheit durchgedrungen ist."

Als wir einem andern Gliede unserer Synode, der auf dem Gebiete der Bibelübersetzung Luthers wohl beschlagen ist, die Schrift von Emanuel Hirsch „Luthers deutsche Bibel"⁴⁾ zustanden, schrieb er uns zurück: "Geradezu verschlungen habe ich, was Hirsch von etwa Seite 65 an schreibt. Ausgezeichnet legt er dar, mit welchem künstlerischen Sinn Luther überseht hat und wie das Altertümliche seiner Sprache seiner Übersetzung keineswegs zum Nachteil gereicht. Auf Einzelheiten kann ich nicht eingehen; nur so viel will ich sagen, daß der wohlwollende, angenehme Ton, in dem er von Luthers Bibel redet, einem ungemein wohlthut. Auch weiß er die paulinische Glaubensgerechtigkeit von der römischen Werklehre wohl zu unterscheiden, und er ist ein liberaler Theolog! Ich fand viel Neues darin, was mir bis jetzt noch nicht recht zum Bewußtsein gekommen war."

Wieder ein jüngerer Pastor, der schon seit Jahren seinen Luther fleißig liest und studiert, schrieb uns vor einigen Monaten: "Habe eben in der letzten Number des CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY Ihre Rezension des Werkes, 'Die Klassiker der Religion'⁵⁾ gelesen und kann nicht umhin, Ihnen zu schreiben. Was Sie über das Studium der Schriften Luthers schreiben, kann nicht genug betont werden. Sie erinnern sich vielleicht meines Fehlers. . . . Der ist Beweis für Ihren Satz: 'Aber mehr als einmal sind mir auch Artikel und Schriften zu Geficht gekommen aus lutherischen Kreisen, auch aus unsrern Kreisen, in denen die Verfasser vor Verlehrtheiten, ja Schwärmerie bewahrt geblieben wären, wenn sie sich durch Luther hätten aus der Schrift belehren lassen.' Ich hatte, wie ich dachte, Luther ziemlich regelmäßig gelesen, aber doch nicht in rechter Weise. . . . Ich machte mich nun an das Studium der Galaterauslegungen Luthers und habe sie überaus lieb gewonnen, so daß ich auch gleich die englische Ausgabe anschaffte. Ich glaube sagen zu dürfen, daß ich wohl noch nie fruchtbare Studien getrieben habe. Will's Gott, so soll *De Servo Arbitrio* die nächste Schrift sein, obwohl ich sie wiederholt kursorisch gelesen habe. Ich bin auf der Suche nach einem billigen lateinischen Exemplar, so daß ich es mit den Übersetzungen vergleichen kann. Luther führt wie kein anderer in die Schrift hinein, und durch keines andern Augen sieht man so klar als durch Luthers."

Der Schreiber hat das richtige Urteil in bezug auf Übersetzungen. Der vor

3) CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, 4, 796.

4) „Lehre und Wehre“, 75, 82. 5) Januarheft, S. 77.

nicht langer Zeit verstorbene Pfarrer D. W. Gußmann, ein tüchtiger Theolog, namentlich in Bezug auf Luther und die Bekenntnisschriften der lutherischen Kirche, sagte treffend in einer Befprechung des Werkes von Prof. D. M. Neu *Luther's German Bible*: „Bei jeder Übertragung in eine andere Sprache gehen gewisse Werte unweigerlich verloren. Nicht selten sogar das Schönste und Feinste, der eigentümliche Duft und Schmelz, der die ursprüngliche Fassung auszeichnet. Sie fallen der Feder des Übersetzers zum Opfer und können vielfach in fremdem Gewande überhaupt nicht wiedergegeben werden.“⁶⁾ Und Prof. D. Hans Preuß, ebenfalls ein hervorragender Lutherforscher, schrieb einmal: „Eine Übersetzung ist doch immer eine abgeschnittene, nach Hegel sogar eine nachgemachte Rose.“

So könnten wir noch gar manche Mitteilungen aus unserm Leserkreise über den Nutzen machen, den man auch von Rezensionen haben kann. Aber das Schreiben solcher Rezensionen bedeutet oft auch ein Stück Arbeit, von dem solche, die es nicht selbst getan haben, kaum eine rechte Vorstellung haben. Gewiß, ein Rezentsent kann nicht alle Bücher von Anfang bis zum Ende durchlesen. Dies ist wohl auch nicht in jedem Falle nötig; aber andererseits muß er wieder manche Bücher gründlich lesen und sich eingehend mit ihnen auseinandersetzen, so daß ziemlich viel Zeit davon in Anspruch genommen wird. Eben deshalb können auch manche Rezensionen nicht so schnell nach dem Erscheinen eines Buches gedruckt werden. Nicht unpassend hat vor einiger Zeit ein Rezentsent gesagt:

„Hat eine Befprechung eines Buches, das schon vor zwei Jahren erschienen ist, heute noch Sinn und Zweck? Es ist begreiflich, daß der Verleger wie auch der Herausgeber des Organs, in dem die Befprechung erscheinen soll, eine möglichst rasche Auflösung wünscht. Weniger begreiflich ist, daß auch viele Verfasser diesen Wunsch haben. Denn was ist die Folge davon, wenn der Rezentsent schnell fertig ist mit seinem Wort? Dann wird das Buch oft nur durchsogen, im besten Falle durchgelesen. Der Verfasser des hier zu beprechenden Buches hat mir vor Jahren einmal auf die Frage, warum er so wenig rezensiere, die Antwort gegeben: „Ich weiß nicht alles besser.“ Der Rezentsent muß ja fast so tun, als würde er es besser als der Verfasser. Mancher tut jedenfalls so, wenn er seine Noten aufstellt. Dabei ist das Rezensieren schwer genug, auch wenn man nicht den Anspruch erhebt, daß man es besser wisse. Man muß ein Buch, das einer ernsthaften Befprechung wert ist, nicht nur anlesen, auch nicht nur durchlesen, sondern in ihm arbeiten, ja noch besser mit ihm arbeiten. Dann kann allerdings eine Rezension nicht so fix erscheinen. . . . Die schnellen Rezensionen werden meist auch schnell vergessen.“⁷⁾

L. F.

Der Schriftgrund für die Lehre von der *satisfactio vicaria*.

(Fortsetzung.)

Apost. 20, 28: *Habt nun acht auf euch selbst und auf die ganze Herde, unter welche euch der Heilige Geist gesetzt hat als Aufseher, zu weiden die Gemeinde Gottes, die er erworben hat durch sein eigenes Blut.*

Der Zusammenhang, in dem diese Worte vorkommen, ist bekannt.

6) Theologisches Literaturblatt, 56 (1935), 88.

7) Theologisches Literaturblatt, 55 (1934), 358.

Der Apostel Paulus war am Ende seiner dritten Missionsreise auf dem Wege nach Jerusalem. Er hatte sich zu Anfang des Jahres 58 drei Monate lang in Griechenland, respektive in Korinth, aufgehalten, *Apost. 20, 3*, und hatte dann durch Mazedonien und über Troas die Rückreise nach Palästina angetreten. Etwa zwei Wochen nach dem Passahfest des Jahres erreichte Paulus die Stadt Miletus, die neun geographische oder dreißig englische Meilen südlich von Ephesus auf der andern Seite eines kleinen Meerbusens lag. Während das Schiff hier vor Anker lag, nahm Paulus die Gelegenheit wahr, eine lange Unterredung mit den ältesten von Ephesus zu haben. Die Klimax dieser Rede findet sich in unserer Stelle.

Der Apostel ermahnt die Pastoren von Ephesus achtzuhaben, als eine Hauptfunktion ihres ποιμανεῖν (1 Petr. 5, 2), zunächst auf sich selber, als die der Herde ein Exempel und Vorbild sein sollen, und dann eben auch auf die Herde, auf die ganze Gemeinde, jung und alt; denn alle Glieder der Gemeinde waren ihrer Seelsorge anvertraut und alle sollten ihre Fürsorge in rechter Weise genießen. Der Apostel weist dabei darauf hin, daß der Heilige Geist sie gesetzt hatte zu Aufsehern der Gemeinde und daß ihr Dienst ein Weiden der Gemeinde Gottes sein sollte, so daß alle Schafe unter ihrem evangelischen Regiment stehen sollten. Es wird hier, im Unterschied von βοσκεῖν, die Aufsicht und Überwachung besonders hervorgehoben.

Und nun folgt der Relativsatz, der für uns in diesem Zusammenhang von besonderem Interesse ist: die er sich erworben hat durch sein eigenes Blut. Subjekt des Satzes ist offenbar das Nomen θόρ, und es wird hiermit klar bezeugt, daß Jesus Christus, um dessen Blut es sich hier handelt, wahrer Gott ist. Und die Tatsache, daß der Sohn Gottes sein Blut dahingeggeben hat, wird verstärkt durch den Ausdruck „durch sein eigenes Blut“. Christus ist, wie der Schreiber des Hebräerbriefs bezeugt, nicht durch der Böde oder Kälber Blut, sondern er ist durch sein eigenes Blut einmal in das Heilige eingegangen und hat eine ewige Erlösung erfunden *Hebr. 9, 12*. Es ist das Blut Jesu Christi, des Sohnes Gottes, das hier in Betracht kommt, das hier in der Waagschale liegt. Bei der in Frage kommenden Erlösung konnte kein Substitut für dies Blut gebraucht werden, sondern es galt sein eigenes heiliges und teures Blut.

Gottes Sohn selber hat also sein Blut gegeben, vergossen. Und damit hat er sich die Gemeinde Gottes erworben. Nicht als ob die Erlösung nicht für alle Menschen geschehen wäre, eine Tatsache, die ja in der Schrift schier überzeugend bezeugt wird, sondern daß die durch ihn geschehene Erlösung ihre Anwendung findet auf die Gemeinde Gottes, auf die Gläubigen, die durch seine Gnade die stellvertretende Genugthuung annehmen. Diese sind durch sein Blut erworben, durch seinen Opfertod sein Eigentum geworden. Denn das Verbum περιποιεῖσθαι bedeutet „für sich erwerben oder gewinnen“. Vgl. schon *Jes. 43, 21*

in den LXX: λαόν μον, δι περιεποιούμεν. Der Apostel bezieht sich hier auf den stellvertretenden Tod Christi, der ja auch sonst immer wieder in der Schrift hervorgehoben wird: Joh. 10, 11, 18; Eph. 1, 14; Tit. 2, 14; 1 Pet. 2, 9. Dabei fällt auch auf, daß der Apostel den Gedanken von Ps. 74, 2 wiedergibt, wo Assaph von dem Erkauften der Gemeinde Gottes redet: ηὐδὲ κατέν, wo die LXX ἐκτήσω, von κτάομαι, gesetzt haben. Durch sein Blut hat sich der Sohn Gottes, Gott, die Gemeinde erkaufst, das Lösegeld erlegt, sie sich zu eigen gemacht. Damit sind die Gläubigen sein Eigentum geworden, wie dies auch Eph. 1, 14 als Zweck der ganzen Erlösung hingestellt wird: „zum Zweck der Erlösung des Eigentums Gottes“, εἰς ἀπολύτων τῆς περιοίησος, „unto the redemption of God's own possession.“ Somit hat Christus durch das Opfern, durch das Vergießen seines Blutes uns die völlige Versöhnung erworben und sich zum Eigentum gemacht.

Eph. 1, 7: In welchem wir haben die Erlösung durch sein Blut, die Vergebung der Übertretungen, nach dem Reichtum seiner Gnade.

Dieser Relativsatz ist einer aus einer langen Reihe von Aussagen, die den Anfang des Epheserbriefes charakterisieren als eine der erhabendsten Perioden, die je auf dem Gebiete der christlichen Theologie geschrieben worden sind. Und das Zentrum dieser einzigartigen Satzperiode ist dieser Satz von der *satisfactio vicaria*.

Christus ist Subjekt des Satzes. In ihm haben wir, die wir durch seine Gnade im Glauben seine Stellvertretung angenommen haben, die Erlösung. In Christo, in dem und an dem wir uns als Christen befinden, haben und besitzen wir die Erlösung, die völlige Loslaufung. Und zwar ist es die Erlösung oder Loslaufung durch sein Blut, denn der Ausdruck ist ein Begriff: es gibt nur diese eine Erlösung oder Freilaufung. Es kann nicht deutlicher ausgesagt werden, als es hier geschieht: „Christus hat durch sein heiliges, teures Blut, indem er sein eigenes Leben als Lösegeld für die Schuldigen einsetzte, die Sünder von der Schuldhaft Losgelauft, die Schuld gesühnt, die Strafe gebüßt.“ (Stöckhardt.) Er redet hier von η ἀπολύτωσις, von der Erlösung, wie sie eben schon seit Jahrhunderten ersehnt worden war. Diese Erlösung ist jetzt unser Eigentum, unser permanenter Besitz.

Dabei ist die Meinung des Ausdrucks durchaus nicht beschränkt auf eine Befreiung von der Macht oder der Beslechtung durch die Sünde, sondern der Apostel weist klar hin auf die Erlösung von der Schuld, der Verbamniss, dem Fluch der Sünde; denn er schreibt im appositionellen Satz: Die Vergebung der Übertretungen. In Christo haben wir ein für allemal die völlige Erlösung von allen Sünden und damit zugleich die Vergebung aller Übertretungen. Was immer sich in und an uns findet an Sünden und Übertretungen in Gedanken, Worten und Werken, das ist alles abbezahlt und abgetan durch die Loslaufung, die durch Christum geschehen ist. „In und mit der Erlösung ist die Ver-

gebung gesetzt, gegeben, vorhanden. Sind die Sünder durch Christi Blut wirklich losgekauft und also vor Gott wirklich los uns ledig von ihren Sünden, von Schuld und Strafe, so sind ihnen eben ihre Sünden und Übertretungen vergeben.“ (Stöckhardt.)

Und daß dies alles geschehen ist stellvertretenderweise, ohne alle unser Verdienst und Würdigkeit, wird von dem Apostel betont, wenn er schreibt: nach dem Reichtum seiner Gnade. Hier sehen wir, wie ein englischer Ausleger erklärt, den eigentlichen Pulschlag aller evangelischen Lehre. Es ist lauter Gnade, was wir auf Seiten Gottes sehen, was wir in der Anwendung des Evangeliums auf uns erfahren. Und diese Gnade kommt zu uns in ihrer ganzen Fülle, mit dem Reichtum der Huld des Vaters durch Christum. Aus seiner Fülle nehmen wir alle täglich und immer wieder Gnade um Gnade. Denn diese Gnade ist ein unver siegbarer Vorrat, ein unausschöpfliches Liebesmeer. Alle diese wunderbaren Gaben gehören den Gläubigen Kraft der Erlösung durch das Blut Christi.

P. E. K.

Dispositionen über die erste von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe.

Achter Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Joh. 7, 14—24.

In diesem Zeitalter des Unionismus und Modernismus sind schriftgemäße Lehrpredigten eine Seltenheit. Es bedarf auch in der lutherischen Kirche der größten Wachsamkeit von Seiten der Pastoren und Gemeinden, daß die fleißige Pflege der Lehre nicht unterbleibe. Die Raritätsfigkeit unserer Zeit trägt dazu bei, den gründlichen Unterricht in Gottes Wort in Kirche, Schule und Haus zu schwächen und oberflächliches Wissen als zufriedenstellend anzusehen. Man sagt von Lehrpredigten, daß sie nicht mehr populär, zu trocken seien, zu große Anforderungen an Prediger und Zuhörer stellen, zu arm seien an Anwendung auf das tägliche Leben, in ihrem Angriff auf die falsche Lehre beleidigend und friedensstörend. Wahre Christen schämen Lehrpredigten. Wie steht's in unserer Gemeinde als solcher und bei dem einzelnen in dieser Beziehung?

Die rechte Pflege der Schriftlehre.

1. Auf uns liegt die Verantwortung, die rechte Lehre gründlich zu pflegen.

A. Tert. Die Juden verwunderten sich, V. 15, weil sie eines Lehrers Autorität und Lehre nur auf Grund eines Studiums auf einer rabbinischen Schule anerkennen wollten. Vgl. auch Matth. 13, 54. So wurde Christi Autorität und seine Lehre in Frage gezogen. Jesus belehrt seine Zuhörer in bezug auf a. seine Autorität, die nicht auf Annahzung ist, noch sich auf die Erfordernisse einer Schule gründet, noch selbsterdacht ist,

noch eigene Ehre sucht, sondern von Gott dem Vater, der ihn gesandt hat, ihm verliehen ist, V. 16. 18. Seine Autorität ist erkennbar und bewiesen. Jesus belehrt seine Zuhörer b. in bezug auf seine Lehre, V. 16. Das, was er lehrt, ist vom Vater. Zum Zeugnis dessen weist Christus hin auf das Zeugnis ihrer Kraft und Wirkung, V. 17, und auf seine Wahrhaftigkeit im Lichte seiner Selbstverleugnung und seines Gehorsams gegen den Vater im Gegensatz zu der Ehrfurcht der Rabbiner. Christi Autorität und Lehre, beide vom Vater herrührend, bringen Pflicht und Verantwortung mit sich, der Jesus vollkommen nachkommt, V. 14. Jede Predigt Christi war Lehrpredigt.

B. Anwendung. 1. In bezug auf die rechten Prediger. Christus vertrat noch heute sein prophetisches Amt. Er hat uns gesegnet mit Pastoren, die predigen kraft der ihnen von Gott verliehenen Autorität. Apost. 20, 28; 1 Kor. 12, 29; 4, 1; 12, 28; Gal. 1, 1; Hebr. 5, 4. Ihre Autorität ist unabhängig von Universitätsstiteln. Sie sind Gefährte Christi und predigen nicht ihre eigene oder anderer Menschen Lehre, sondern Gottes Lehre, direkt aus der klaren Schrift allein geschöpft. Das ist ihre hohe Pflicht und Verantwortung vor Gott und seiner Kirche. 2. In bezug auf die Zuhörer. Wenn der Prediger besonders Gewicht legt auf die Lehre, dann sollen sie ihn als Gottes Boten anerkennen, die Schriftlehre annehmen als Gottes Wort, als Christi Lehre. Luk. 10, 16; 2 Kor. 2, 17; 1 Theß. 2, 13. An der Kraft und Wirkung des Wortes Gottes wird es dann nicht fehlen. Testimonium internum, Pieper, Dogm., I, 372 f.; Joh. 6, 40. Auf uns Predigern und Zuhörern liegt die Verantwortung, die Lehre gründlich mit der uns von Christo verliehenen Autorität zu pflegen.

2. Die rechte Betrachtung und Anwendung der Schriftlehre bringt Überzeugung und Segen.

A. Tert. Nun macht Jesus eine praktische und gründliche Anwendung. Er handelt von der Sabbathfeier. Veranlassung: Kap. 5, 16. Das rechte Verständnis fehlt den Juden durch Selbstverhuldung, und in demselben Maß kam falsche Lehre und falsches Leben auf. So wurden sie zu Pharisäern und Mörtern. a. Der Juden ungerechtes Urteil und blinde Konsequenz, v. 19—22, der Auswuchs ihrer durch ihre Traditionen geschwächten Kenntnis der Schrift, auch der Auswuchs ihrer Bosheit, erforderte einen zu ihrer Seligkeit rechten und gründlichen Unterricht von seiten Christi. b. Sein Unterricht ist der Not und den Zuhörern angepaßt, deckt ihre Sündhaftigkeit an der Hand des Gesetzes auf, und offenbart Jesus als den Sohn Gottes und Heiland, aber nicht ohne Widerlegung der falschen Lehre (Polemik), und zwar so gründlich, daß einerseits der Zuhörer Gewissen getroffen wurde und andererseits viele an ihn glaubten, V. 31. So hat Jesus jede Lehre recht und gründlich vorgetragen, den einen zur Strafe, den andern zum Wachstum im Glauben und Leben.

B. Anwendung. a. Denken wir ja nicht, daß Lehrer und Schüler

die alte Schriftlehre entbehren oder mit einem Minimum der Schriftlehre auskommen können. Jesus hat immer wieder Lehrpredigten gehalten. Die Betrachtung der sechs Hauptstücke, und ihre Anwendung auf das tägliche Leben muß recht fleißig und gründlich wiederholt werden. Treue Prediger und gläubige Zuhörer wollen das. Ja Jesus will's, Matth. 28, 20a; Joh. 8, 31, 32; Apost. 20, 27. — b. Rechter Unterricht im Gesetzen offenbart und widerlegt Menschengezeze und überführt das Gewissen. Rechter und gründlicher Unterricht im Evangelium verherrlicht Jesus, erzieht die Christen zu Schriftgelehrten und schärft ihr Urteil. Warum sind Adventisten Adventisten und Calvinisten Calvinisten? Weil es bei ihnen an der rechten Gründlichkeit in der Schriftlehre fehlt. Und warum sind wir, was wir sind? Weil, allein durch Gottes Gnade, bei uns das gründliche sola Scriptura gilt. Das erzielt auch Einigkeit des Glaubens und bewahrt vor falscher Lehre.

Es ist für Prediger und Gemeinde das beste Zeugnis, daß beide in der Lehre fest gegründet sind. Siehe Luther X, 369.

G. H. Smukal.

Neunter Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Matth. 12, 38—44.

In der Schrift wird viel von Frömmigkeit geredet. Gott fordert Frömmigkeit, 1 Mos. 17, 1; Ps. 37, 37; gibt ihr herrliche Verheißungen, 1 Mos. 4, 7; Ps. 112, 2, 4; Matth. 25, 21; usw. Um dieser Forderung nachzukommen, um Segen davon zu haben, muß unsere Frömmigkeit rechter Art sein. Nicht alles, was sich als Frömmigkeit ausgibt, ist wirklich Frömmigkeit. Es ist von Wichtigkeit, zu erkennen, was wahre, was falsche Frömmigkeit ist.

Zweierlei Frömmigkeit,

1. eine äußerliche, eigenbürtige, verdammliche;
2. eine innerliche, selbstlose, gesegnete.

1.

W. 38 werden Schriftgelehrte genannt. Das waren Leute, die sich zu Kirche und Gottes Wort hielten, damit fleißig umgingen, eine gute Kenntnis der Schrift hatten, sich untereinander und mit Jesus befragten, willig waren, immer mehr zu lernen und auch andern Aufschluß zu geben, Matth. 2, 4 ff. Das ist nicht verkehrt. Wollte Gott, es gäbe mehr Schriftstudium, größeren Eifer, in der Erkenntnis der göttlichen Wahrheit und des Heilandes zuzunehmen. Apost. 17, 11. Auch beteten sie viel, W. 40. Ebenfalls nicht verkehrt, sondern von Gott geboten. Nicht ihr Schriftstudium, nicht ihr Beten war verkehrt, sondern die ekelhafte Heuchelei, die sich bei so vielen unter ihnen fand.

W. 38—40. Unter dem Vorwand der Frömmigkeit suchten sie die eigene Ehre, wollten von den Leuten geprüft und obenangesezt werden, suchten den eigenen Vorteil, scheuten sich nicht, unter einem Schein des

Rechts selbst arme Witwen um Haus und Hof zu bringen, damit sie ihren Bauch füllen könnten. Sie kummerten sich nicht um Gottes Ehre und das Wohl des Nächsten; sie sorgten nur für das eigene Ich. Wieviel Selbstsucht, Eigennutz unter dem Deckmantel des Christentums findet sich noch heute! Man schließt sich der Kirche um äußerem Vorteils willen an; man gibt für die Gemeinde nur, wenn man selber Nutzen, Vergnügen, Speise für den Bauch bekommt; selbst vor Unrechtheit in Handel und Wandel scheut man sich nicht, wenn man nur Gewinn hat.

B. 40b. Scheinbar haben sie Gewinn von ihrer Heuchelei. Sie werden begrüßt, sitzen oben an, werden geehrt; sie leben herrlich und in Freuden, verschwelgen mit Freßen und Saufen das unrecht erworbene Gut. Aber sie haben ihren Lohn dahin, Matth. 6, 2, und endlich werden sie verdammt von dem Herrn, der sie kennt und verabscheut, und ihre Verdammnis wird um so schwerer sein, je mehr sie äußere Frömmigkeit geheuchelt haben. Lassen wir uns warnen vor solcher Frömmigkeit.

2.

B. 41. Es gab noch viele, die für Gottes Reich etwas übrig hatten. Gar viele von diesen werden in rechter Gesinnung, aus Liebe zu Gott und seinem Wort und aus Dankbarkeit für die empfangene Gnade, also im rechten Glauben gegeben haben. Unter diesen werden auch manche Schriftgelehrte gewesen sein, denn Schriftgelehrsamkeit ist nicht unverträglich mit wahrer Frömmigkeit, soll vielmehr die rechte Quelle wahrer Frömmigkeit sein, da ja die Schrift von Christo, dem Heiland, dem Urheber aller gottgefälligen Frömmigkeit, zeugt. Jesus sah auch viele Reiche viel einlegen, und bei vielen wird das auch ein Beweis ihres Glaubens und ihrer Liebe, also wahre Frömmigkeit gewesen sein.

B. 42. Sie hat es weit gebracht in ihrer Frömmigkeit. Weder die Geringfügigkeit der Gabe (Ihr Fleisch wird ihr gesagt haben: Behalt ihn doch! Was nützt ein Heller? Wer achtet darauf?) noch die Größe der Gabe (alles, was sie hatte, ihre ganze Habe) hielt sie von dem Geben ihrer Gabe ab. Welch ein herrliches Beispiel wahrer Herzengrömmigkeit! Wenn das weiter nichts gewesen wäre als äußeres Tun, Werkgerechtigkeit, Lohnsucht, dann hätte der Herzengläubiger sie nicht so gerühmt. Ihre Frömmigkeit, aus dem Glauben fließend, erweist sich in ihrer Liebe, daß sie ihr Letztes dem Herrn gibt, Ps. 73, 25. 26; in ihrem Gottvertrauen, daß er sich ihrer annehmen werde, daß er selbst ihre kleine Gabe segnen werde; in ihrer Gottesfurcht, daß sie sich scheut, den Tempel zu verlassen, ohne dem ihre Gabe geopfert zu haben, der gesagt hatte: 5 Mose. 6, 5. Sich selbst vergessend, ist all ihr Sinnen und Denken, Herz und Seele auf ihren Gott allein gerichtet.

B. 43. 44. Das Urteil Jesu. Sein Segen ruht auf ihr und ihrer Gabe. Es wird uns nicht gesagt, daß er ihr Opfer durch irdischen Segen vergolten habe. Sie mag arm geblieben sein, sie mag gehungert haben, weil sie ihr Letztes ihrem Gott geopfert hatte. Dann tat sie es aus Liebe zu ihm, und Jesus wollte sie dieses guten Werkes nicht berauben. Er

hat sie auch nicht zu sich gerufen und ihr gesagt, wie hoch er ihre Gabe schätze. Sie wird heimgegangen sein, ohne eine Ahnung davon zu haben, daß ihre Gabe aller Welt zum Beispiel in der Bibel aufgezeichnet werden würde. Aber Gott hat sie und ihre Gabe reichlich gesegnet. Wie viele sind durch ihr Beispiel zu gleicher Frömmigkeit, zu gleicher Gottesfurcht, Gottesliebe, Gottvertrauen gereizt worden! So segnet Gott noch heute Frömmigkeit. Freilich, wer deswegen fromm ist, weil er auf Lohn hofft, wer deswegen reichlich gibt, den Zehnten opfert, damit Gott es ihm imirdischen desto reichlicher lohne, der ist nicht fromm, der ist selbstsüchtig, der hat keinen wahren Segen, selbst wenn es ihm irdisch noch so wohl ergeht. Allein wahre Frömmigkeit, die aber auch gewiß, gefällt Gott und wird von ihm nicht unbelohnt bleiben. Ps. 97, 11. Th. Lätsch.

Zehnter Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Matth. 21, 33—44.

„Und als er nahe hinzukam, sahe er die Stadt an und weinete über sie.“ Dies sind die tieftraurigen Worte, mit denen das altkirchliche Evangelium dieses Sonntags beginnt. Auf dem Wege nach Jerusalem, als die Menge ihm zujubelte und Hosanna rief, hielt der König Israels auf einmal an. Als er die Hauptstadt des jüdischen Landes mit ihren Palästen und dem Tempel des Herodes überblickte, konnte er sich nicht enthalten. Er gedachte der unendlichen Gnade und Liebe, wie Gott sie dem Volke dieser Stadt offenbart hatte; er gedachte aber auch des schändlichen Undankes, womit die Juden alle Heilstaten Gottes unter ihnen belohnt hatten. Besonders sah er im Geist seines bevorstehenden Tod am Kreuz und hörte schon das „Kreuzige, kreuzige ihn!“ „Sein Blut komme über uns“ usw. derer, die jetzt Hosanna riefen. Er wußte, daß sein Blut über sie kommen, daß Gottes Gericht sie treffen würde. Deshalb weinte er über die Stadt. Dies war am Palmsonntag. Zwei Tage später, am Dienstag der Karwoche, redet er im Gleichnis von der selben Sache, von der Verachtung der Gnade Gottes, und von der Strafe, die darauf folgt.

Die Verachtung der Gnade Gottes eine folgenschwere Sünde.

1. Die Sünde; 2. ihre Folgen.

1.

Der Text redet von einem Häusvater, der vor seinem Wegzug in ein fernes Land einen Weinberg pflanzte und ihn mit besonderer Sorgfalt pflegte, um Früchte zu ernten, V. 33. Nachdem er dies getan hatte, übergab er den Weinberg den Weingärtnern. Sie sollten ihn pflegen und natürlich einen Teil der Ernte für sich behalten. Der Weinberg war in solch guter Verfassung, daß der Häusvater mit Recht auf gute Ernten rechnen konnte. Doch er wurde bitter enttäuscht. Die Knechte, die er zu den Weingärtnern sandte, um den ihm zufallenden Teil zu

fordern, wurden mißhandelt, gesteinigt, ja getötet. Die Weingärtner wollten augenscheinlich den ganzen Nutzen vom Weinberge für sich behalten. Als andere gesandt wurden, erging es ihnen nicht besser. Zugleich hoffte er, daß die Weingärtner sich wenigstens vor seinem Sohn scheuen würden, aber auch den nahmen sie und töteten ihn in der Hoffnung, daß nun der Weinberg ihr Eigentum würde.

Erklärung des Gleichnisses ist einfach. Der Hausvater ist Gott, der Weinberg die jüdische Kirche. Sie waren das ausgewählte Volk Gottes. Er hatte wahrlich nichts versäumt in der Pflege dieses seines Weinberges, Jes. 5, 4. Er hatte ihnen alles gegeben, was zu ihrem geistlichen Wohl nötig war. Die Weingärtner waren die Kinder Israel selbst, sowohl die Obersten wie auch das gemeine Volk. Ihnen wurde die Sorge und Pflege der Kirche überlassen. Er sandte ihnen Propheten, seine Knechte. Er sandte andere, größer als die ersten, bis auf die Tage Johannis des Täufers. Schließlich sandte er seinen eingeborenen, innig geliebten Sohn zum Heiland und Seligmacher. Das war die große Gnade, die Gott Israel erwies. Doch leider machte Gott keine bessere Erfahrung als der Hausvater im Gleichnis. Durch seine Propheten erinnerte Gott Israel an seine Schuld, ermahnte er es, rechtschaffene Früchte der Buße zu bringen. Doch ohne Erfolg. Israel verböhnte, mißhandelte, verfolgte, tötete die Propheten, Jer. 20, 2; Matth. 23, 35. Andere, größere Propheten wurden nicht besser behandelt: Johannes der Täufer. Schließlich sandte Gott seinen Sohn; den töteten sie, nachdem sie ihn jahrelang verfolgt hatten. Darum fragt Jesus mit Recht: Matth. 23, 37. Und in unserm Text: V. 42. Um Dienstag der Karwoche sprach er diese Worte, am Freitag sollten sie erfüllt werden. Da gerade jetzt versuchten sie, ihn zu greifen, V. 46.

Viele Menschen unserer Zeit sind nicht besser als jene Juden. Würdigen nicht, was Gott für sie getan hat und noch tut. Sogar in Kirchen, die Gott reichlich mit der Wahrheit gegeben hat, gibt es solche. Weigern sich, auf Prediger zu hören, ja widersprechen ihnen, verfolgen sie. Verwerfen die Botschaft vom Heil, leben in Sünden. Manche unter ihnen spielen führende Rollen, andere sind Glieder christlicher Gemeinden und leugnen doch Hauptwahrheiten des Christentums. Verwerfen den Eckstein Christum. Kreuzigen den Herrn aufs neue. Und wie steht es mit der Masse, die die Einladung zum großen Abendmahl verhöhnt? Sie alle verachten die Gnade Gottes. Aber wehe ihnen! Es ist dies eine folgenschwere Sünde.

2.

Israel wollte nicht Buße tun, den Heiland annehmen. So kam Gottes Gericht über das halsstarrige Volk. Das wird hier vorherverkündet durch dies Gleichnis. Er beendet das Gleichnis mit einer Frage: V. 40. Um des Volkes willen, das versammelt war, mußten die Hohenpriester und Ältesten antworten, V. 41. Doppelt tragisch, daß die, die schon Pläne schmiedeten, um ihn zu töten, mit ihren eigenen Worten

das Urteil über sich selbst und über ihr Volk sprechen müßten und daß sie, die wohl verstanden, worum es sich handelte, nicht Buße taten.

Denn Jesu deutete sehr klar dieses Gleichnis, V. 43. Ihr seid also die bösen Weingärtner im Gleichnis; von euch soll das Reich Gottes genommen und andern gegeben werden. Auch als Einzelpersonen sollt ihr eure Vorrechte einbüßen. Wer sich an Jesu ärgert, wer sich dem Fortschritt der Kirche widersetzt, wird zermalmt, V. 44.

Die schauerliche Wahrheit dieser prophetischen Worte sollte ihnen bald vor Augen gestellt werden. Das Wort Gottes, die Rechte und Segnungen des Eigentumsvolkes sollten ihnen genommen werden. Sein Blut kam über sie. Jesu Tränen waren nicht bedeutungslos. Israel beharrte in seinen Sünden; so kamen die Römer und „nahmen ihnen Land und Leute“. Kein Stein blieb auf dem andern in Jerusalem. Furchtbare Gottesgericht. Und Gottes Fluch lastet noch auf Israel. Paulus mußte den Juden sagen: „Siehe, so wenden wir uns zu den Heiden“, Apost. 13, 46. Das Reich wurde andern gegeben; durch die Predigt der Apostel wurde die Kirche unter den Heiden gegründet. Isaacs Haus blieb wüste. Das Schrecklichste kommt noch, nämlich am Tage des Weltgerichtes. Dann wird der verworfene Edelstein die Widersprecher zermalmen, weil sie die Gnade verachtet haben.

Dies sind die furchtbaren Folgen der Verachtung des Heilandes und seines Wortes. Noch heute dieselben. Wer Jesum verwirft, verwirft alles. Wer den Sohn nicht hat, der hat auch den Vater nicht. Er hat Sünden, die nicht vergeben sind, kann sie nicht selber führen, muß ohne Hoffnung bleiben, kann keine Gnade erhoffen in Unvollkommenheit. Einerlei, wie glänzend seine Werke sein mögen, er hat Christum hier verworfen und muß ihm dann als gerechtem Richter begegnen. Und der Zorn Gottes bleibt über ihm in alle Ewigkeit.

Geliebte, laßt uns die ernste Warnung des Textes beherzigen. Wir sind gerade so reichlich gesegnet wie Israel, ja reichlicher. Haben das Wort Alten und Neuen Testaments; die Offenbarung von Christo, die reine, seligmachende Lehre, können das Wort hören und lernen. Laßt uns nicht die Gnade Gottes verachten, indem wir Gottes Wort gering schätzen, in Sünden leben, durch unsere Werke selig werden wollen. Solche Un dankbarkeit würde uns teuer zu stehen kommen; Gott würde Wort und Sakrament uns nehmen und andern geben, die die Gnadenmittel höher schätzen. Schließlich müßten wir, wenn wir die Gnade verachteten, ewig verderben, weil wir nicht erkannt hätten die Zeit, darinnen wir heim gesucht würden. Nein, laßt uns die Warnung zu Herzen nehmen, unsere Seligkeit schaffen mit Furcht und Bittern; statt un dankbar zu sein, uns freuen über die Gnade in Christo und über die Gnadenmittel und sie als höchstes Gut schätzen, so daß wir erbauet werden auf Christo, dem Edelstein, und endlich selig werden. Indem wir an die Verächter der Gnade denken, wollen wir dem Herrn Treue geloben und ihm sagen: Joh. 6, 68. 69. Lied 240, 10. Paul König.

Elster Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Mar. 2, 13—17.

Wie eifrig ist man heutzutage bestrebt, die verschiedenen Krankheiten, womit Menschen behaftet sind, besser kennenzulernen und zu heilen! Die Ärzte bemühen sich aufs äußerste, die rechten Heilmittel für ihre Patienten zu ersinnen; weitgehende Untersuchungen werden ange stellt, um die Ursachen gewisser Krankheiten festzustellen; in Zeitschriften und Büchern belehrt man fortwährend die Leute, wie sie der Krankheit vorbeugen und ihre Gesundheit wahren sollen. Das ist gewiß alles sehr nötig und wichtig. Wenn wir Krankheit an unserm Leibe verspüren, sollen wir alle Mittel gebrauchen, um wieder gesund zu werden. Aber wenn die Heilung der Krankheit am Leibe von Wichtigkeit ist, so ist doch die Heilung der Krankheit der Seele viel wichtiger.

Die Heilung der Seele.

1. Die Krankheit der Seele; 2. der Arzt der Seele;
3. die neue Kraft der Seele.

1.

Wie es viele Menschen gibt, die nicht glauben, daß sie krank sind, obwohl die klaren Anzeichen der Krankheit dem Arzte offenbar sind, so gibt es auch viele Menschen, die es leugnen, daß sie an der Seele krank sind. Mit solchen hatte es der Heiland im Text zu tun. Er saß zu Tische mit Zöllnern und Sündern; darüber ärgerten sich die Schriftgelehrten und Pharisäer; er sollte mit solchen Menschen doch nicht verkehren. Sie zeigten durch ihren Tadel, daß sie meinten, sie seien keine Sünder. Der Heiland erklärte, B. 17, daß diese Menschen, mit denen er zu Tische saß, kranke seien und daß ihre Krankheit die Sünde sei; und er ließ seine selbstgerechten Fragesteller deutlich fühlen, daß auch sie mit der Sündenkrankheit behaftet seien.

Alle Menschen leiden an dieser Krankheit. Unsere ersten Eltern wurden davon angesteckt, und die Seuche der Sünde hat sich auf alle ihre Nachkommen fortgepflanzt. Manche leibliche Krankheiten zeigen sich meistens bei Kindern und jungen Leuten; andere wieder bei älteren Menschen. Die Sünde, die Seelenkrankheit, findet sich bei jung und alt, 1 Mos. 8, 21. Manche Krankheiten findet man nur in gewissen Gegenden; ein bestimmtes Übel, das vielfach in heißen Landesteilen auftritt, findet man selten in kälteren Gegenden; die Sünde ist überall in der Welt zu finden. Eine Krankheit, die man oft bei ganz armen Leuten sieht, weil die rechte Nahrung fehlt, kommt nie bei wohlhabenden Menschen vor; die Sünde ist bei Reichen und Armen zu treffen. Für diese Krankheit der Seele haben Menschen kein Vorbeugungsmittel erfunden, und es läßt sich auch das Umschreiten der Krankheit durch Absperrung nicht hindern. Wie töricht ist es doch, wenn Menschen diese Krankheit der Seele wegleugnen wollen! 1 Joh. 1, 8. Läßt uns erkennen, daß wir diese Krankheit haben; dann werden wir uns auch an den rechten Arzt der Seele wenden.

2.

Jesus ist der Arzt für die Krankheit der Seele. In unserm Text sagt er, daß er der Arzt für die Sünder ist; daß er sie heilen will dadurch, daß er sie zur Ruhe ruft, V. 17. Was erwarten wir von einem Arzt? Doch das, daß er die Krankheit genau kennt und wirklich heilende Arznei verordnet. Jesus kennt unsere Krankheit; er weiß, daß wir Sünder sind. Er ist der Herzgenüßdiger. Er weiß, was im Menschen ist. Er wußte, wo es dem Gichtbrüdigen am meisten fehlte, Matth. 9, 2. Dieser Arzt weiß viel besser als der Kranke selbst, wie schlimm es mit ihm steht, daß die Krankheit zum Tode ist. Und Jesus bringt dem Kranken das einzige rettende Heilmittel, das seligmachende Evangelium. Das Heil, das Christus am Kreuz für alle Menschen erworben hat, ist im Evangelium eingefäßt, und wer dieses Mittel im Glauben annimmt, der heilt seine Seele, der hat die Vergebung der Sünde und die Seligkeit.

Was für einen wunderbaren Arzt haben wir doch für die Krankheit unserer Seele! Andere Ärzte müssen gerufen werden; dieser kommt von selbst zu uns. Andere Ärzte versuchen dieses und jenes, bis sie ein rechtes Heilmittel finden; dieser hat ein unfehlbares Mittel. Andere Ärzte heilen nur für dieses Leben; dieser heilt für die Ewigkeit. Jesus ist auch der einzige Seelenarzt. Töricht ist es, wenn der Schwerkranke allerlei eigene Mittelchen versucht, um die Kosten des Arztes zu sparen, oder wenn er unerfahrene Ärzte aufsucht, während doch ein zuverlässiger Arzt zu haben ist. Wie töricht, wenn der Sünder sich selbst heilen will oder anderswo als bei Jesus Hilfe sucht! Jesus ist der rechte Arzt für unsere Seele; wir wollen uns ihm allein anvertrauen.

3.

Wenn der Kranke gesund geworden ist, so hat er wieder neue Kraft. Er will nicht mehr liegen und untätig sein; er will an die Arbeit; er will seine wachsenden Kräfte gebrauchen. So ist es auch mit einem, den Jesus von der Krankheit der Sünde geheilt hat. Ein solcher steht im Glauben und in neuer, geistlicher Kraft. Der Heilige Geist gibt ihm Kraft, gegen die Sünde zu kämpfen und allerlei gute Werke zu tun. Wir sehen davon etwas an Levi, wie Matthäus in diesem Text genannt wird. Er war ein Zöllner. Diese Beamten hatten viel Gelegenheit, Geld zu unterschlagen. Wahrscheinlich war Levi auch nicht unschuldig geblieben. Aber nun beruft ihn Jesus. Er verläßt sein Amt, das ihm so viel Versuchung brachte, und wird ein Jünger Jesu. Er ist an der Seele geheilt. Und sofort regt sich bei ihm der Wunsch, etwas Gutes zu tun. Er sorgt dafür, daß andere Sünder Jesum hören können, V. 15. Seine Seele ist gewonnen; nun sucht er andere zu gewinnen. Auch wir wollen die Kräfte gebrauchen, die Jesus uns gibt, wenn er unsere Seele heilt. Wir wollen die Sünde meiden und Gelegenheit suchen, Gutes zu tun.

F. Niedner.

Zwölfter Sonntag nach Trinitatis.

Matth. 9, 27—34.

„Wunderbar“, Jes. 9, 6. Wahrlich, wunderbar ist Jesu in seiner ganzen Erscheinung. Nur er ist Gott und Mensch in einer Person, Kol. 2, 9. Darum bringt uns auch die Schrift so viele Wunder von ihm, Wunder seiner Macht, Weisheit, Gnade und Liebe. Das war Zweck seines Kommens, Luk. 19, 10; 1. Joh. 3, 8. Der Evangelist Johannes sagt uns etwas von der Fülle und dem Reichtum der Wunder Jesu, Kap. 21, 25; 20, 30. 31. Im Text werden zwei Wunder beschrieben, die Jesu zu Kapernaum verrichtet hat.

Zwei Wunder Jesu, zu Kapernaum verrichtet:

1. die Heilung zweier Blinden,
2. eine Teufelaustreibung.

1.

V. 27. Zeit zu Ende der großen galiläischen Wirksamkeit Jesu. Jesu hatte seinen ersten Wohnort, Nazareth, verlassen und war nach Kapernaum gekommen, in „seine Stadt“, Matth. 9, 1. Hier geschahen die beiden im Text berichteten Wunder. Es war wieder ein rechter Gnadentag für Kapernaum: Heilung des Gichtkrüchigen, Unterredung mit den Jüngern der Pharisäer und des Johannes über Fasen, Auf erweckung der Tochter des Schulobersten Jairus. Als Jesu aus dem Haus des Jairus heimkehrte, folgten ihm die beiden Blinden. Die Kunde von Jesu Predigten und Wundern war gewiß zu ihnen gedrungen. So kamen sie denn zu Jesu, wahrscheinlich von Freunden oder Verwandten geführt. Sie folgten Jesu nach, schrien und sprachen: V. 27. Das war eine demütige und glaubensvolle Bitte. V. 28. „Sohn Davids“ nannten sie Jesum. Das war geläufige Bezeichnung Jesu, Matth. 15, 22; 20, 30 f.; Mark. 10, 17; Luk. 18, 28. Mit dieser Bezeichnung wollten sie zu vertheidigen geben, daß sie glaubten, er sei der Messias, der nach der Schrift gerade solche Wunder tun sollte, Jes. 35, 4 f. Vgl. Matth. 21, 9; 22, 42. „Erbarm dich unser“, so bitten sie. Sie pochen nicht auf Verdienst und Würdigkeit, sondern kommen als Bettler und bitten demütig, daß er ihnen diese Kunst, diese Gnade erweise.

Nicht sofort erhört Jesu sie. V. 28. Sie folgten ihm nach bis in sein Haus. Sie werden auch unterwegs einmal über das andere geschrien haben, V. 27. Im Hause traten sie ganz in seine Nähe mit der Bitte: V. 27. Warum hat der Herr sie so lange warten und schreien lassen? Matth. 7, 7 f.; Ps. 145, 19; 50, 15; Jes. 65, 24. Er wollte sie prüfen, wie er das lanaanäische Weib prüfte, Matth. 15, 21—28. Ihr Glaube sollte geläutert und gestärkt werden. Sie sollten ein ganz bestimmtes Bekenntnis ihres Glaubens ablegen. Daher auch die Frage Jesu V. 28. Jesus fragte sie nicht seinetwegen (Joh.

2, 24 f.), sondern ihretwegen. Sie sollten sich prüfen, ob ihre Bitte wirklich aus rechtem Glauben und festem Vertrauen käme, daß er als der von Gott gesandte Messias und Erlöser solche große Macht habe. Ihre Antwort war klar und positiv. Da war kein Zögern und Zweifeln, V. 28 c. Darauf geschah die Heilung, V. 29, 30 a. Durch das Anröhren wollte er dies Wunder recht eindrucksvoll machen und ihr Augenmerk auf sich und auf das, was er tat, richten. Die Worte, die Jesu dabei sprach, V. 29 b, sind Worte göttlicher Kraft, wie die Schöpfungsworte 1 Mof. 1 beweisen, daß er der Sohn Gottes ist. Er ist der Herr, der usw., Ps. 33, 9. Mit diesen Worten machte er aber auch die Hilfe abhängig von dem Glauben; vgl. Matth. 8, 13; Mark. 9, 23 f. Vom Gebet soll niemand denken: Wir können es ja einmal versuchen; wenn es nicht hilft, dann schadet es auch nicht. Nein, das rechte Gebet fordert Glauben im voraus, Mark. 11, 24; Matth. 21, 22. Mit diesem Wunder bewies Jesu seine Gotteskraft und Heilandsliebe. Zweck — Joh. 20, 31; 2, 11.

V. 30 b. „Bedräuete“, machte das Verbot so stark und eindrucksvoll wie möglich. So bei andern Gelegenheiten, Matth. 8, 4; 12, 16; 16, 20; 17, 9; Mark. 8, 26. Warum das Verbot? Seine Stunde war noch nicht kommen, Matth. 12, 14—16. Sie sollten erst in Ruhe über das Gnadenwunder nachdenken, damit nicht die leibliche Heilung, sondern der Sünderheiland ihnen die Haupfsache würde.

2.

V. 32, 33 a. Jesu hatte selten Ruhe. Vgl. Mark. 3, 20, 21. Kaum waren die Blinden geheilt und weggegangen, so brachte man einen Besessenen, der stumm war. Solche Besessenen gab es viele zur Zeit Jesu. Der Teufel war damals besonders eifrig und geschäftig, seine Macht auszuüben, und es scheint, als habe Gott ihm besondere Erlaubnis gewährt, die Menschen zu plagen, damit die Macht Jesu über den Satan und sein höllisches Reich desto herrlicher offenbar würde. Vielleicht waren es auch hier Freunde oder Verwandte, die den Mann zu Jesu brachten. Und Jesu heilte ihn, trieb den Teufel aus. Wie? Das wird nicht gesagt. Mark. 1, 23 f. hören wir, wie Jesu einen Besessenen bedräuete, dem Teufel zu verstummen und auszufahren gebot. So mag es wohl auch hier gewesen sein. Als bald hatte der Stumme seine Sprache wieder, V. 33 a.

Was war die Wirkung bei dem Volk? V. 33 b. Diese Leute hatten gewiß schon manches Wunder Jesu gesehen. Keins aber schien ihnen so merkwürdig, so außerordentlich wie dieses. Sind sie zum Glauben gekommen? Das war ja der Zweck Jesu auch bei diesem Wunder. Aber davon hören wir nichts. Sie kannten den Menschen, wußten, daß er stumm gewesen war, und sahen und hörten nun, daß er reden konnte; trotzdem wird ihre Begeisterung nur eine vorübergehende gewesen sein, die keine bleibende Frucht brachte. Vgl. Matth. 11, 23, 24. Wie steht es bei uns? Hören auch wir die Predigt, sehen auch wir die Wunder

der Gnade Gottes, die noch heute geschehen, ohne dadurch selber zum Glauben gebracht zu werden? Prüfen wir uns!

Es waren auch offensbare Feinde Jesu zugegen, wie so oft, wenn er seine Macht bewies und Gutes tat, V. 34. Schon in Jerusalem waren sie dem Herrn in feindseliger Weise entgegengetreten. Einige von ihnen erschienen nun auch hier in Galiläa, offenbar zu dem Zweck, dem Einfluß Jesu entgegenzuarbeiten. Nicht einmal, sondern immer wieder werden sie so geredet haben (Imperfectum). Vielleicht gingen sie auch von einem zum andern im Volk und redeten so. Sie konnten nicht leugnen, daß Jesus Teufel austrieb; aber die Wahrheit wollten sie nicht erkennen, nicht zugeben, daß Jesus das durch Gottes Finger, durch den Geist Gottes tue. Der Geist Gottes, der durch Jesum redete, bezeugte sich auch an ihrem Gewissen. Trotzdem lästerten sie und schämten Gist hervor aus dem bösen Grund ihres Herzens und gaben Gottes Werk für Teufelswerk aus. Das war die Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist, die Sünde, deren alle diejenigen sich schuldig machen, die Gottes Geist und Wirkung an ihrem Herzen verspüren, diese Wirkung aber gewaltsam unterdrücken und wider besseres Wissen und Gewissen schmähen und lästern, was Gottes Geist redet und wirkt. Solche Menschen haben zerrüttete Sinne, sind untüchtig zur Buße und finden keine Vergebung weder in dieser noch in jener Welt. Hüten wir uns vor Verachtung des göttlichen Wortes, damit wir vor dieser schrecklichen Sünde bewahrt werden. Hebr. 3, 12. 13; 10, 26—31. Lied 244, 7. 10.

A. C. Klammer.



Miscellanea.

Father Divine.

The following paragraphs are taken from an article by Sutherland Denlinger, which appeared in a recent number of *The Forum* (quoted by permission).

"On the evening of November 5, 1933, it had pleased the black "God" to descend from that 'main branch' of 'Heaven' which is at 20 West 115th Street, Manhattan, and appear, a short, stout, dignified figure with the wistful eyes of a setter dog, before some five thousand true believers gathered at the Rockland Palace, Harlem dance-hall, to sing his praises.

"He sat on the stage, surrounded by his angels—Faithful Mary and Satisfied Love, Wonderful Joy and Sweet Sleep, Good Dream and Bouquet, and all the rest of them—and his thick lips parted in a wide smile beneath his scraggly moustache, as he watched the folks stowing away his free chicken dinners in the balcony and the folks shouting, 'Peace, Father! It's wonderful!' on the main floor.

"Father Divine heard the chanting (He's God, He's God, He's God, He's God, He's God,) to the tune of "Marching through Georgia"), and he heard the rhythmic thumping of the big bass drum and the hypnotic blare of the trombone, and he witnessed the fervent enthusiasm of this comparatively small segment of his two million followers, and he obviously found it good. He beamed, his almost bald pate bedewed with perspiration. . . .

"The story of Father Divine is a story so fantastic that only the boldest and most imaginative of fiction-writers could send anything like it clattering from his typewriter and still make it seem plausible. Disregard both the statements of the credulous and the cynical explanations of the heathen, and the mystery surrounding the source of his income alone is as absorbing as any problem ever tackled by the most resourceful of pulp-paper sleuths. Real-life detectives of one sort or another have often tried to get to the bottom of it, without success.

"Father feeds thousands every day without charge. Father maintains heavenly dormitories, in which hundreds live on his bounty. Father travels in limousines and maintains a fleet of busses to take the faithful to meetings, and when Easter comes, Father rides the skies in a big red airplane while Harlem's thousands, gazing ecstatically upward from the curbings, hail him as God. And when Father has to go to court, which happens occasionally, his roll of bills draws envious comment from the magistrate on the bench. Father says that the money comes from heaven, and since he takes no collections and none of the cynic theories would account for any sizable portion of his expenses, it seems as good an explanation as any—for the moment. . . .

"By the late autumn of 1934, Father Divine had come a long way from the heavenly mansions in Sayville. It was beginning to keep him busy just 'swinging around' the fifteen branch heavens in the metropolitan district alone. He had an increasing number of white followers throughout the country, too, and the main branch of God's kingdom just off the Avenue resembled the headquarters of the Abyssinian high command.

"The five-story building at 20 West 115th Street, in that no man's land which lies between black Harlem and the habitat of the mestizo Spanish peoples, has a somewhat ecclesiastical air, due largely to its Gothic trimmings. At every hour, from morning until the morrow's dawn, there are always disciples at the door to greet every arrival with a hearty cry, 'Peace, Brother, it's wonderful! Peace!'

"Enter the vestibule, and you can hear, above the clamor of the disciples who are just 'standing around,' the din of the diners in the basement. The luscious odor of corned beef and cabbage or fried chicken is wafted upward, together with an industrious rattle of tableware and the chant of the singers of hymns, sometimes muffled as though their mouths were very full. 'I can't give you anything but love, Father,' sing the hungry ones, in fervent parody of the song made famous by the not at all religious Blackbirds.

"On the main floor is an auditorium; above the auditorium are dormitories (as the kingdom grows, Father simply reaches into his pocket and rents another brownstone-front 'annex'); and on the topmost floor are the divine offices. Climbing, one hears the temporal click of a busy typewriter, and one's eyes light upon signs painted on canvas and hung against the walls to the greater glory of the Father.

"'Peace,' reads one, 'Father Divine is the light of the world. The tree of life is blooming, blooming for one and all. Father Divine, I thank you, Father.'

"And another: 'Father Divine has brought peace to the Nation. He is God. If you keep his sayings, you will never see death.'

"'Every language, tongue, and nation must bow,' screams a sign. 'Father Divine is God, His Blood has Paid It,' shouts a banner propped into an angle of the wall. And, ambiguously: 'Peace! I am that I am, and Who can Hinder Me? The Lord is My Shepherd and I shall Not Want; I Mean Father Divine!'

According to the latest reports Father Divine has now bought a large estate, where he will establish himself with his followers. P. E. K.

Are the Comics Moral?

There is food for thought in an article by John K. Ryan in a recent number of *The Forum*, from which we quote (by permission) : —

"Sadism, cannibalism, bestiality. Crude eroticism. Torturing, killing, kidnaping. Monsters, madmen, creatures half brute, half human. Raw melodrama; tales of crimes and criminals; extravagant exploits in strange lands and on other planets; pirate stories; wild, hair-raising adventures of boy heroes and girl heroines; thrilling accounts in word and picture of jungle beasts and men; marvelous deeds of magic and pseudoscience. Vulgarity, cheap humor, and cheaper wit. Sentimental stories designed for the general level of a moronic mind. Ugliness of thought and expression. All these, day after day, week after week, have become the mental food of American children, young and old.

"With such things are the comic strips that take up page upon page in the average American newspaper filled. Repeated and drilled into their readers countless times by vivid pictures and simple words, the crude,

trivial, debased, and debasing features of the comic strips are more than a sign of the prevailing infantilism of the American mind. They are at once an effect and a powerful contributing cause of that infantilism. The number and character of the comic strips at the present time are a cultural phenomenon and psychological portent of the most serious kind.

"The change that has come over the comic section in recent years is an episode in journalism that most Americans have watched with interest. Perhaps the interest has been in many cases unconscious, but it has been extremely real. The fact that the comic section has reached its present size and power is ample proof of the tremendous interest it holds for American readers of all ages and classes. The power of a popular strip over circulation is notorious. For a paper to lose its best strips means disaster, almost ruin. The Supreme Court itself had to decide which Washington paper was to have exclusive rights to the deeds of Andy Gump, Dick Tracy, and their friends.

"Starting in most cases with a single comic strip,—*the Katzenjammer Kids*, *Buster Brown*, *the Van Loons*, or the like,—the typical large-city paper had added first one and then another. To-day it is difficult to find an important paper (there are a few notable exceptions) without at least one full page of comics on weekdays. Other strips will be spotted at strategic points in the news and advertising sections.

"Sunday of course is the field-day for the artists of the comic world. The colored supplements vary in size in competing papers, but growth in size is the rule. For a time Hearst's *Comic Weekly* reached a peak of fifty comics in thirty-two tabloid pages. However, readers of the comic section evidently like both print and pictures large, clear, and untaxing; so the *Comic Weekly* has been restored to the standard size.

"This growth in size and importance of the comic section has brought startling changes in the subjects and nature of the strips themselves. To-day the term 'comic section' and the older term 'funny pictures' are misnomers, for the newspapers are now showing strips that make no pretense of wit or humor. Along with funny pictures of the traditional type the comic section now shows pictured stories that have all the worst features of the lowest type of fiction and some features peculiar to itself. . . .

"Crimes, killings, torturings, not all so horrible or pictured so vividly as the death of Doc Hump, are essential ingredients in the criminal-detective strips. It is true that virtue is invariably triumphant, that the law is vindicated, that the police are the heroes and the criminals the villains. But the evil effects of prolonged and repeated brutalities are not wiped out by a final and rather hurried triumph of law and virtue. In fact, this triumph itself may take the form of more death and carnage, of more crude scenes.

"This brutal and brutalizing element is found in other strips besides those dealing with criminals. Pictured stories of wild, extravagant adventure (like Alex Raymond's *Flash Gordon*; *Brick Bradford* and *The Time Top*, by William Ritter and Clarence Gray; Edgar Rice Burroughs's *Tarzan* pictures; Lee Falk's *Mandrake the Magician*) are guilty of like things. Nor is one of the most popular of all features, *Little Orphan Annie*, without its quota of crimes, criminals, and deeds of death. . . .

"For a still more elaborate and consistent use of some of the things that have just been mentioned Edgar Rice Burroughs's *Tarzan of the Apes* strip is outstanding. Popular for over twenty years in books and movies, Tarzan's adventures among men and beasts in strange places are now extending their popularity in a syndicated feature made up of pictures and running commentary. A single episode in the life of Tarzan usually lasts about six months, appearing six days a week. On Sundays, in the colored supplement, Tarzan is engaged in further adventures. In his exploits sadism, exhibitionism, savagery, and animalism are skilfully used, along with the familiar characters and situations of melodrama—villains and villainesses, heroes and heroines, plots and counterplots, and the rest.

"In one of the episodes in Tarzan's career as a hero of the comic strips a Hollywood movie company making a picture in Africa is attacked by savages, with plenty attendant slaughter. Two American girls in the company are captured by Arabs, who are in turn attacked by huge gorillas. The gorillas are shown overpowering the Arabs and finishing them off by sinking their 'great fangs into the throats of their adversaries.' The sex interest of this fable had been kept somewhat in reserve while the girls were in the movie company and among the Arabs, but now that they are in the hands of gorillas, it is given a larger and more hideous place. These are gorillas with a difference. They speak Elizabethan English, are called by such quaint names as Henry VIII, Wolsey, and Buckingham. They are, in fact, the results of the experiments of a mad English scientist whom they call the Maker. . . .

"The repetition in word and picture of sadism, bestial and degenerate scenes and characters, is a more serious matter. Such things make their deep impression upon the plastic minds of growing children and have their dangers for the never-to-mature minds of countless adults. The effects of the worst type of comic strip upon immature minds should prove an enlightening study to educators and psychologists. The prevention and correction of such effects are a task for an aroused public conscience."

Saving the Young.

That the Roman Catholic Church is wide awake to the special difficulties connected with early and middle adolescence appears from an article by John P. McCaffrey in *The Commonweal* for April 24, 1936. Some statements from this article are worthy of careful study, as when the author states:—

"No one will deny that society has a part of the responsibility for crime. Those who have studied the matter know that environment plays a heavy part in leading the boy into trouble. Society is mainly responsible for this unhealthy environment. In a general way we know that slum areas are the breeding-grounds of crime, the cancer spots of our social life. The efforts of cities and States and Federal agencies to replace these slum areas are well aimed. The danger, however, is that the people who now live in the slums will not be able to pay the rents asked in the new developments, and the net result will be not the abolition of the slums, but their removal to a new area. The rent of these new projects must be kept as low as possible to achieve the desired reforms.

"It is in the slum areas that the street gang starts. The step that the street gang takes in becoming a criminal mob is a short one. We know that the gang starts as a protest on the part of the boys in a neighborhood against their living in that neighborhood, which most of the time is a slum area. Boys need companionship, and they find it in the gang. The gang is often the one bright spot for them as a refuge from the homes they live in. The gang does things that are attractive. The common activities of the gang give the thrill of living to its members. A dashing leader, the thrill of common stealing and fighting, the roar of a bonfire, the gang club house in a vacant lot or an old cellar, form the setting that lures the boy into the meshes of the gang. In a word, he wants to belong, and soon he is initiated into the gang. He picks up the gang code, a set of rules of conduct that makes the gang a little society within the social structure. The great rule of the gang law is not to tell, not to squeal on another gang member. The gang interests become the interest of each member — 'One for all and all for one' makes of the gang a band of adventurous musketeers in the midst of the squalor and dirt of the slums. A new spirit, a dangerous spirit, is born.

"I firmly believe that society should *move in* on the gang and control it. There is not much sense in trying to destroy it because it is the answer to the fundamental needs of the boys, but society can direct it and keep it from becoming an antisocial mob. It can sublimate the ebullient spirit of the gang and lift it up.

"How can this be done?

"The adventurous spirit of the gang is usually harmless when the boys are very young. It is when they enter the dangerous years between fourteen and eighteen that serious trouble is encountered. *Just before this time the substitution for the gang should come.*"

The care of the confirmed youth is included in the work of every faithful pastor. Guiding the junior is one of the specific jobs of the pastor. The Walther League is trying very hard to give assistance. It will pay our pastors to study its literature on this question. P. E. K.

Our Weaker Freshmen.

In the Catholic weekly *America* of May 16, 1936, the following editorial appeared, the force of which seems obvious.

"In a recent issue of a popular weekly, an American long resident in England hesitatingly offers a comparison between British and American secondary schools. He does not state openly that our institutions are inferior, but merely that the English schools are 'different.' On closer examination it becomes quite evident that the differences between the two systems are neither few nor light. Boys who propose to enter one of the great English public schools are carefully examined, and those who cannot show that they are capable of profiting by the course are rejected. In the United States we proceed on an entirely different principle. All boys and girls under sixteen years of age must attend school regardless of their ability to profit by further educational opportunities. Consequently Americans who go to Oxford are often surprised to discover that youngsters

of sixteen who come from Eton, Harrow, or Winchester are far better prepared than Americans two or three years their seniors.

"This is now an oft-told tale. Its moral has been put before us again and again, but we have not been impressed. We still cling to the delusion that education must be 'democratic,' and interpret the Declaration of Independence to mean that all Americans are endowed not only with equal political rights, but with equal intellectual ability. Consequently we insist that every boy and girl not absolutely a moron shall go to school until he or she is sixteen years of age. From grade to grade they pass, being lifted from the lower to the higher not by their advance in knowledge, but by the procession of the calendar years. It is inevitable that this automatic process will bring the majority to the portals of the secondary school, and through them all who have not completed the sixteenth year must pass.

"What they do after the door has closed behind them, is, as Mr. Toots would say, of no consequence. The law is satisfied as long as they are in school, interpreting *school* as a building which contains a certain number of men and women who are styled 'teachers.' What is taught does not seem to be of much consequence either, except that it must be something that the pupil will condescend to notice, such as tap-dancing or how to repair a radio or the care of hens. The great American principle of accommodation removes all difficulties. Since the pupil must go to school or his parents must go to jail, and since the pupil is incapable of further intellectual progress, the problem is solved by hiring men and women under the authority of the local board of education, hoping that they will know what can be done under the circumstances. Just how the problem can be met when President Roosevelt has succeeded in persuading the States that all boys and girls ought to go to school until they have finished their eighteenth year, is merely another question which the next generation must answer.

"The real point of importance is not whether our secondary schools are better than those in England, but whether they may rightly be deemed schools at all. At the recent faculty convocation at Fordham University the Rev. Charles J. Deane, S. J., dean of St. John's College of the University, deplored the fact that the freshmen who come up for examination are much inferior to those of other years. This deterioration Father Deane traced, according to the report in the *New York Times*, to the tendency away from liberal-arts courses in our high schools, and particularly to their neglect of Latin and of mathematics. Father Deane also blamed the shortening of school hours and the reduction of school- and home-study periods. Briefly, our boys and girls are the victims of an unsound educational system which is apparently growing stronger year by year. With the classes in the high schools filled with pupils unable to do the work proper to these grades, but compelled to attend school, standards are lowered until the chief difference between one of our high schools and any other building in which young people are kept for three or four hours per day is in the name.

"Up to the present, we have been glad to subsidize our schools without questioning the results. It is high time to ask whether what we have been paying for is worth the price."

Modern Mass Music.

Under this caption Alastair Guinan wrote in the *Commonweal* a few years ago: —

"With the means as such by which composers express the words of the liturgy ecclesiastical lawgivers have no concern; nor have they legitimately laid claim to any. From the viewpoint of canon law — let us remember that the late Dr. Adrian Fortescue has reminded us that all rubrics are but special cases of canon law — it is a matter of indifference whether the *Gloria in Excelsis* be clothed in the simple plain-song melody called the Ambrosian, in the elaborate melismatic chant of the *Missa Magnae Deus Potentiae*, in the polished polyphony of Palestrina's *Missa Papae Marcelli*, in the German classicism of Anton Bruckner's *Mass in F Minor*, or in the strange, new harmonies of a strictly modern composition like Hendrik Andriessen's *Missa in Festo Assumptionis*. Let the music express the text: it is holy; let it conform to the canons of the style to which it belongs: it is true art; let it appeal to its hearers: it is universal. Evidently laws so truly catholic leave open a large field for personal taste; and this is well; it is desirable that the artistic judgment of the musician be allowed full scope.

"Recent writers have dwelt with unnecessary emphasis on what they call the 'impersonal character of the liturgy and of plain-song.' Nor have they neglected to bemoan 'the inability of modern composers to write in an impersonal manner.' To my mind nothing can be more mischievous than undue insistence on the idea that the liturgy is impersonal. This notion, in which there is a germ of truth, is one of those ideas of which Cardinal Newman said that to explain them adequately it is necessary to explain them away. Because the liturgy is a corporate act, it does not thereby cease to be a personal act on the part of each doer. It grew out of the personal devotion of generations of Christians. All the prayers and texts have strikingly personal applications, as may be seen by any one who reads them even cursorily.

"One has only to consider such melodies as the sequence *Victimae Paschali Laudes* as the type of high jubilation and the gradual *Christus Factus Est* as the type of meditative sadness and holy awe (the third section of course has a triumphal character all its own in harmony with the thought '*Deus exaltavit illum . . .*'), to understand that the composers of these melodies were thinking, not impersonally, but in distinctly personal fashion; they hoped, by recording in tone pictures their personal reactions to the words, to intensify the meaning of those words and to bring this meaning to each of their hearers in a personal way. It is so that each member of the body makes his personality a part of the corporate act, not by extinguishing it, but by dedicating it. All do this: the composer, the singer, the hearer, each in his own fashion." — That represents the Roman Catholic viewpoint.

P. E. K.



Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

An Article in the "Lutheran Sentinel" on "An Invitation for Cooperation and Union." — In its issue of May 20, 1938, the editor of the *Lutheran Sentinel*, the Rev. J. E. Thoen, writes as follows: —

"In our *Lutheran Sentinel* we have reported on an invitation from the United Lutheran Church of America and the American Lutheran Conference extended to the synods constituting the Synodical Conference. The invitation requests that committees be elected to confer concerning cooperation between the different synods and approachments for the purpose of forming a union between all Lutheran bodies in America. It is not a request to confer concerning doctrine in order to attain unity of faith and confession, but a request to confer concerning arrangement of the work in missions and other fields in order that there may be a better cooperation and understanding between the churches. This sounds fine and friendly, but it is, nevertheless, an invitation to begin cooperation before unity of doctrine is attained.

"As our readers know, our synod belongs to the Synodical Conference. Our synod has not as yet answered the invitation except a preliminary answer by its president. The two largest synods of the Synodical Conference replied to the invitation at their last conventions. We published their answers in the *Lutheran Sentinel* and added a few remarks. The Missouri Synod accepted the invitation and elected a committee to confer with committees from the churches extending the invitation, while the Wisconsin Synod refused to elect a committee to confer at present under the prevailing circumstances. It may seem that there is disagreement between these two synods because the one has accepted the invitation and the other has refused. We believe, however, that there is no essential disagreement. When we read the Missouri Synod's answer to the invitation, it appears clearly that it does not think of any union or even cooperation before unity of doctrine is attained, but it is willing to confer by committee in order to come to an agreement in doctrine. The Wisconsin Synod is not willing to confer by committee now, since there as yet is not sufficient agreement in doctrine and practise to carry on conferences concerning union and cooperation. It points to different things which the inviting body must correct before there can be any talk about such conferences as the invitation proposes.

"It is our opinion that the Wisconsin Synod has acted with the right wisdom and care in this matter. We know from sad experience what doctrinal discussions by so-called union committees may bear. When committees are chosen to confer with the purpose in view to unite the churches which they represent, they are tempted either to yield to one another in the discussion of doctrinal questions or to use ambiguous and diplomatic expressions or terms for the purpose of leading the opposition to adopt their presentation of the doctrine. The result becomes an agreement which may be understood in two different senses, and the two parties may with some right claim that they have defended the doctrine of their Church

and persuaded the opposition to adopt it as right doctrine. The agreement thus becomes a compromise, and both parties stand as before without having attained true unity. When the results of the discussions are published, it is very difficult for one who was not present and heard the discussions to know just what was intended by the expressions used, and he is obliged to cast his vote in reliance on the statement of the committee which represented his Church that it has persuaded the opposition to discard its false doctrine and adopt the right. But he who votes for union in that way does not do so because he is convinced that true unity is attained. He votes for union because the committees claim that unity is attained, not because he himself knows that it is so. If the committee of the opposition reports to its Church that by the discussions it has been convinced its Church has hitherto taught false doctrine contrary to the Word of God and earnestly seeks to win its Church for the true doctrine, it would prove that the committees have come to a true agreement, but it does not prove agreement between the churches before the opposition has rejected its wrong doctrine and adopted the right.

"When we consider this and other things which it may become necessary to contemplate, it is not difficult to understand that doctrinal discussions by committees is not the right procedure in order to obtain unity of faith between church-bodies. There is a different way which is the natural one and brings true unity. That is public testimony in speech and writing. The people in a church-body must also be persuaded, and that is not done by persuading a few men in a committee to give up their false doctrine. When the public testimony has borne fruit, so that it appears that two church-bodies which were disagreed teach and practise the same, then it is time to confer by committee concerning cooperation and union. As far as we are able to understand, this is the view of the Wisconsin Synod, and we are convinced that that is right. It is dangerous to experiment with committee conferences concerning union before it is apparent that there is unity between the church-bodies. That history shows us."

We feel that this is not the place to debate the question whether the policy championed above is wise or not. It is our wish, however, to acquaint our readers with the views expressed by the *Lutheran Sentinel* on the important matter with which the reprinted article is dealing.

A.

A Major Unionistic Venture. — In the *Lutheran* of April 23 we find an open letter signed "P. E. S.," which reports as follows: —

"For years the National Preaching Mission now projected for the fall of 1936 has been in the hearts and minds of a group of men who have earnestly felt the need of a revival of religion throughout our country and the world. The plans have at last taken definite shape, and from September through November twenty-five cities will be visited by the mission, with a three- or four-day program for each center, including not only public mass-meetings in the evenings, but also seminars for ministers and church leaders, addresses and groups in colleges, factories, among business men, etc. The names of those who have definitely agreed to participate are:

"The Rev. E. Stanley Jones, India; Miss Muriel Lester, England; the Rev. John S. Whale, England; Dr. T. Z. Koo, China; the Rt. Rev. Richard

Roberts, Toronto; the Rev. George A. Buttrick, New York City; the Rev. Lynn Harold Hough, Madison, N. J.; the Rev. Albert W. Beaven, Rochester; the Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, Pittsburgh; the Rev. R. H. Miller, Washington, D. C.; the Rev. George W. Truett, Dallas; the Rev. Ivan Lee Holt, St. Louis; the Rev. Paul E. Scherer, New York City; Bishop Arthur J. Moore, San Antonio; the Rev. Merton S. Rice, Detroit; the Rev. John A. Mackay, New York City; Bishop Henry Wise Hobson, Cincinnati; the Rev. Douglas Horton, Chicago.

"The purpose of the mission has been stated as follows:—

"'An authentic Christianity is a perpetual act of judgment. It shall be the object of this mission to understand and apply that judgment in respect of the individual, the Church, and contemporary life, with courage enough to accept it when it comes to us as condemnation and humility enough to appropriate it when it comes to us as grace.

"The mission shall therefore seek to teach and preach in its fulness the Gospel of our common Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; to confront, through group contacts and public meetings, as well the clear thought and courageous will of the American people as their finer feeling and best tradition; in a world which irreligion is on the verge of destroying, to stress once more the reasonableness of the Christian faith, its aptness to the deepest needs and the highest aspirations of human life, and its creative power in the organizing and shaping of a bewildered society toward the standards and ideals of the kingdom of God.

"And, finally, wherever counsel is asked or assistance needed, the mission shall lend itself to the continuance of such a program within local communities, in order that changed lives, ever the result of God's working, may be enabled through the Church of Jesus Christ to make their lasting impact upon a changing world.'

"Here is a move not toward high-powered organization, but toward cooperation in the preaching of a whole Gospel. Instead of standing idly by to judge, may we not as Lutherans, in so far as possible, give the mission the support of our presence, what encouragement we have to offer, and surely the courtesy of a hearing? Personally I have believed in its possibilities because I have believed in the spirit of the men who are responsible for it. It is not a 'great preacher series' nor any such thing; it is an earnest and honest attempt concertedly to focus the pressure of the Gospel of Christ at strategic points in our national life, hoping that from these points will spread whatever power and influence can be brought freshly into being under the added impetus of united effort. It is our privilege at least to pray that in God's own fashion the mission may prove a blessing in this time when our common Christian faith needs the accent of both voice and life."

That this venture, which is altogether unionistic, will have largely a modernistic complex is asserted by Dr. Frank Norris, the militant Texas Fundamentalist among the Baptists. A.

Economic Cooperation, Modernism's Newest Substitute for the Gospel. — From an address delivered in the Glen Echo United Presbyterian Church, Columbus, O., by its pastor, Rev. Wm. E. Ashbrook, which the *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference* published in its April issue, we quote the following: "The Ohio Council of Churches through its

annual pastors' convention makes audible the voice of Modernism in Ohio. . . . In order that we might brush up in our understanding of the social gospel, we have again attended most of the sessions of the pastors' convention. . . . In the light of what we have heard the past week, just what does Modernism have to offer to a sin-cursed and troubled humanity to-day? First of all, it offers an attack on the person of Jesus Christ. One of the early speakers informed us that 'orthodox Christianity has never said that Jesus was God. That idea originated about the fourth or fifth century. The idea that Jesus Christ was God would have been obnoxious to the apostle Paul, and Athanasius would have denied it. Those who say that have no standing in orthodox Christianity. It is not that Jesus was God, nor even like God, but that God, the Power behind the universe, was Christlike.' . . . Now that leads us to consider the second thing that Modernism as represented by the Ohio Council of Churches has to offer. It presents a program of social reform to take the place of individual salvation through the precious blood of Christ. . . . Two lengthy addresses were given by Dr. Fred Fisher of Detroit, who set forth with elaborate eulogy the progress in social reform that is being made in Russia to-day. 'It is a new country where man is brought into his own.' . . . Dr. Fisher was followed later on the program by Mr. E. R. Bowen, general secretary of the Cooperative League of the United States of America. He is one of the leading advocates of Consumers' Cooperative. And the Consumers' Cooperative, in case you haven't heard, is the new Messiah of Modernism. 'The Church was founded to heal the diseases of selfishness,' he said. 'Plenty awaits us if we will just reach out and take it. As long as the Church stays with capitalism, it should die.' . . . So it was throughout this convention. Here was a great organization of churches sponsoring a program that placed no emphasis upon the need of telling lost sinners of a Christ who died to save them, silent on the subject of the new birth and sounding no call to prayer or repentance. This council says nothing about sin and salvation. Apparently the modern mind is done with such old-fashioned things. Instead it offers crusades against military training and schemes for redistributing wealth. It adopts, as our newspapers have reported, a portion of the Communistic scheme, and it does this in the name of what they term the 'kingdom of God.' . . . To what follies will churchmen not give themselves when they lose their faith in Jesus as the Son of God and the Savior of men! For in all this we could discern no salvation for the soul and no need for cleansing from the guilt of sin."

E. Stanley Jones insists that this gospel of Modernism in its newest form is the real Gospel, is what Jesus meant when He declared that He was anointed "to preach the Gospel to the poor," Luke 4, 18. In *Christ's Alternative to Communism* Dr. Jones writes: "All we can say now is that the first item of the program—good news to the poor—would mean, according to the total teachings of Jesus and according to the results of that teaching and that spirit in the lives of the early Christians, the creation of a new kind of society, spiritual in its basis, but issuing in a collective economic charity and cooperation in which each would have material goods according to his need—poverty would be banished. The only good news to the poor that would be adequate would be that

there are to be no poor" (p. 83). "We can prepare for the public ownership of public resources and utilities, to which society must come if we are to stop selfish exploitation, by training the group mind in the handling of collective projects through cooperatives. Kagawa of Japan is making the forming of cooperatives among various types in various occupations a part of the Kingdom of God Movement. He is improving the economic and moral condition of vast numbers and at the same time training them for the new cooperative society — the kingdom of God on earth" (p. 280).

The *Christian Century*, the stalwart advocate of Modernism, is of course heart and soul for Modernism's newest interpretation of the Gospel. "The cooperative movement which Toyohiko Kagawa will preach to Americans and Canadians will include consumers' cooperatives, to be sure, but it will also point out the necessity for at least seven other types of cooperative organization. It will call for producers' cooperatives, credit unions, utilities' cooperatives, land cooperatives, insurance cooperatives, and many forms of mutual-aid cooperatives — social insurance in all its phases, including medical and educational insurance. Entered upon voluntarily, those who live in the social enclave set up by practise of this fully rounded cooperative program will find themselves in a society approximating mutuality. They will have at least a fair chance to develop and display a way of life which will attract others because its rewards are larger, mean more to the human spirit, and last longer than the rewards offered in a dog-eat-dog struggle for survival. . . . Kagawa has come under the belief that he has a word of divine revelation intended for the Christian intent on achieving a Christian world — a world of brothers relieved of a brutal obsession with the insensate pursuit of private gain. Can such a world be brought into existence? Kagawa declares that it can be and that he has discovered how." (Dec. 4, 1935.) "The cooperative movement has now come into the focus of the Church's attention and is making a far more potent appeal than any concrete program has ever made as a plan of Christian activity on the economic level. Awareness of the Christian aspect of this movement has been greatly intensified by the presence in America of Dr. Kagawa, who has inspired an extensive development of cooperation in Japan and who sees the cooperative movement as an integral part of the Christian Gospel." "There are grounds for real hope that we are about to witness in this country a new and vital fusion of personal and social religion such as Kagawa himself typifies, which will impart new reality to the religious life of the churches. At the same time, through the awakened interest of church people, an added impetus is being given to the actual growth of cooperatives and, it is to be hoped, to those other forms of political and economic action which look toward a righteous society." (March 11, 1936.) E.

The Inspiration of the Gospel according to Mark, according to the "Lutheran Church Quarterly." — This periodical published in its April issue an article by W. P. Bradley, "The 'Cursing' of the Fig-tree," from which we quote the following: "As told by Mark, the so-called cursing of the fig-tree is perhaps the strangest incident in the life of Jesus. It is more than strange. It is shocking. The tree was in leaf, and Jesus hoped to find figs upon it. Disappointed in this, He cursed the tree, and it died. The condition of the story is singularly and significantly chaotic.

Some of its details are out of harmony both with the main theme of the story and with each other. Such a condition is by no means uncommon in Mark. . . . Shortly after they left Bethany, Jesus 'hungered.' Why was that? Had He eaten nothing there? If not, why not? . . . The words used by Jesus would seem to enjoin barrenness, not death. But death was what happened. Now its death doubtless put an end to the fruitfulness of the tree; but if Jesus really wished the tree to die, he could easily have said so. . . . Jesus, who had been considerate enough the day before, when borrowing an ass's colt for use in the triumphal entry, to assure its owner that He would send the animal back promptly (Mark 11,3), is now said to have deprived this owner of his tree, not only without due process of law, but apparently without a thought. . . . According to Mark a period of incubation intervened between the curse and its consummation. Nothing happened at first. Nothing seems to have happened all that day. At any rate the disciples noticed nothing in the afternoon when they returned the same way to Bethany. It was not till the morning of the next day that they saw the result. Then they saw that the tree had 'withered away from the roots,' and Peter calls the attention of Jesus to the fact: 'Rabbi, behold, the tree which *Thou cursedst* is withered away.' . . . Jesus is represented by Mark as saying in effect . . . that with faith in God not only can you *accomplish* anything you wish, but you can also *obtain* anything you wish and which you pray for. These undoubtedly genuine words of Jesus, so vital and inspiring in almost any other connection, are inexpressibly degraded by being uprooted and transplanted hither to serve as suitable (!) comments on the cursing of a fig-tree. . . . Such is the story as Mark tells it." How could such a story have originated?

"It would seem more reasonable to suppose that originally the story had a quite different meaning from the present one and that not long before Mark's gospel was written something happened which changed that meaning completely. In such a case, and in the absence of suitable editing, the original details of the story, which of course would have been in harmony with its original meaning, would become inappropriate under the new one. It is this view which we shall assume to be the correct one and by which we shall be guided in our attempt to solve Mark's puzzle. . . . We shall reach our goal most directly by attacking the problem at its stronghold, so to speak, by examining again the very peculiar wording of the 'curse.' 'No man (no one) eat fruit from thee henceforward forever.' This wording puts the emphasis upon the *people* who shall never again be permitted to find pleasure or profit from the tree. Now, all that is needed to bring simplicity out of the chaos is to suppose that Jesus used the future indicative and that there was nothing mandatory in His thought. In the English translation this would require the insertion of the auxiliary 'will': 'No man (no one) *will* eat fruit from thee.' Let us see how this change works out. According to this reading, which from now on we shall assume to have been the original one, it *will* have been something peculiar about the appearance of the tree which attracted the attention of Jesus, from a distance. And since the tree was in leaf, it *will* have been something peculiar about the appearance of the leaves which did it. A nearer view showed that the tree was dying,—indeed, that it was already far gone. Then Jesus *will* have said in effect, Your usefulness is over. Thus, so

far from dooming innocent people to loss and the tree to barrenness, Jesus really will have voiced His regret at the condition which He found. . . . To be specific, not only is Jesus now absolved from the charge of vindictiveness arising from disappointed hunger, but there is no longer any need of speculating as to the nature and origin of that hunger. Instead of having to explain the hunger, we now see that the hunger was introduced to explain the curse! . . . As to the matter of ownership, there is now no need of invoking the eminent domain of the Son of God in order to legitimize His behavior towards the property of other people. For Jesus did not kill the tree, and He had no thought of so doing. . . . Doubtless the disciples repeated the original words of Jesus just as they had heard them. Those who got them from the Twelve would repeat them in the same way to others, and so on down the years *until* some day some brother with the gift of insight, as he would probably put it, and with singular zeal for the authority of the Christ, would sense a far more intimate connection between the words of Jesus and the death of the tree than had previously been thought of. For the first time it would seem to this person that the tree must have died not merely *as* Jesus saw and said that it *would*, but *because* He said it *should*, in short, because he cursed it. . . . It is a fair question whether we may not infer that it was precisely Mark himself who first detected the 'curse' in the kindly words of Jesus. If the discoverer were not Mark, but some predecessor of his, that predecessor must have been a person whose method of literary composition was just like Mark's. He also must have left the resulting chaos just as he made it, without a thought of editing out the incongruities, just as Mark would have done—and did." There is a lot more, but we do not care to transcribe anything more.

By no stretch of language or imagination could the term "inspiration—given by inspiration of God" be applied to Mark's gospel under the premises set down by this critic. He certainly does not believe in any sort of inspiration; otherwise he would be guilty of blasphemy in penning the above words.

But having finished with Mark, he will have to deal with Paul. He will have to charge Paul with making an overstatement in 2 Tim. 3, 16. Paul made a serious mistake in failing to add a note to the statement "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," a note to this effect: This statement does not cover the sorry piece of fiction which Mark produced.

And the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* uses its facilities to bring this sorry piece of higher criticism into the studies of the pastors of the United Lutheran Church.

E.

Modernism Wrestling with the Bible.—A writer in *Christendom*, the new modernistic quarterly, in the course of a long article entitled "Sincerity and Symbolism" expresses these thoughts: "The account of the Creation in Genesis, the anthropomorphic descriptions of God throughout the Old Testament, the Christmas-story of the Incarnation, the resurrection of the body of Christ, the empty tomb and the watching angels, the coming of the kingdom of God upon earth 'with power and great glory,' the descriptions of heaven in the Revelation, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, the doctrine of the virgin birth and the divinity of

Christ, Transubstantiation and the miracle of the Eucharist,—all these conceptions, intended at first quite literally, have for many devout Christians to-day only a symbolic function. To many a deeply religious Christian who cannot accept their literal intellectual meaning they are full of emotional power, and the emotion, the total attitude of the soul which they express to the liberal Christian of to-day, is probably not very different from that which they have expressed and helped to nourish through all the Christian centuries. Hence they are still scrupulously retained, lovingly cherished, but considered as poetic expressions of some profounder or larger truth than that which their formulators realized. Thus an originally literal definition of religious belief by a gradual transition often loses its strictly scientific values and takes on during the process an emotional or conative value as the symbolic vehicle of some conception much more profound than that which it at first expressed, yet which, if reframed in the logical terminology of our day, would be largely lacking in those emotional overtones which constitute an essential part of what we really mean and need to say.

"I wish, then, to raise the question whether such a use of ancient symbols as I have suggested be really dishonest or insincere. When an expression no longer believed to be literally true, but standing in the individual's mind as an expression of some larger truth which he firmly believes is found to be a helpful means for rousing the confidence, the peace, the joy, the aspiration, the loyalty of religion, may it not still be rightly and sincerely used? It may at any rate be argued that, just as there is no insincerity in saying that the conclusion 'depends' upon the premises, although we know that in the case at issue nothing *hangs* from anything else, so there is nothing untruthful or insincere in using a religious symbol to mean something quite different from that which its originators intended. The Fatherhood of God may have been asserted originally in a thoroughly anthropomorphic sense. But there is no reason why a modern man who has long since given up anthropomorphic views should not use the phrase with all honesty to express an emotional belief with its overtones and its coloring, with all that it means to him,—something which no scientifically cold terminology could express. When religion seeks to indicate and suggest larger cosmic relations of the sort indicated, or a sense of ultimate loyalty, or an entire attitude of the whole self, hallowed and traditional phrases, poetic, musical, or plastic formulations may be even truer than conceptional definition."

The Lutheran reader will not expect that we pillory every misconception and error which appear in the above extract. We have submitted it to show how Modernism in spite of itself is endeavoring to cling to the Bible or, to look at it from the opposite point of view, how Modernism in spite of the Bible's condemnation of its tenets is seeking to justify sponsoring them.

A.

Can "Friendly Calvinism" Appreciate Lutheranism? — Dr. Lorraine Boettner, Professor of Bible, Pikeville College, Pikeville, Ky., writing in *Christianity To-day* (April, 1936) under the title "Presbyterianism, Lutheranism, and Methodism: Our Common Heritage and Our Differences," proves that he belongs to the "friendly Calvinists," that is

to say, to those defenders of the Reformed faith who try honestly to appreciate Lutheranism both historically and doctrinally. And yet even "friendly Calvinists" cannot rightly estimate Lutheranism and truly appreciate its message and mission. The point deserves careful watching since, especially of late, quite a number of Calvinistic theologians have been very pronounced in their praise of confessional Lutheranism. The praise is accorded to Lutheranism in so far as Lutheranism and Calvinism stand upon common ground in their opposition to Romanism and Modernism. However, as soon as the old differences between the two denominations enter into the discussion, then the Reformed of to-day stand precisely where their forefathers stood at Marburg or where the *Consensus Tigurinus* or the *Admonitio Neostadiensis* stood. A few quotations may show how orthodox Calvinists to-day view the rise, development, and mission of the Lutheran Reformation. Dr. Boettner writes: "To Luther, the destructive leader, it was given to slay the medieval monster Sacerdotalism, or priesthood; to Calvin, the constructive leader, it was given to clarify and systematize Christian theology." Here certainly we have a most untrue and unhistorical antithesis posited between the two groups of Protestants. Really the contrast between Luther and Calvin is not that the one destroyed, while the other developed and crystallized Protestant thought. In his opposition to Romanism, Calvin in many respects was as destructive as was Luther; however, Calvin was destructive not only over against the Papacy, but also over against Biblical truths which the German Reformation so clearly and beautifully brought back to light. In the final analysis Calvin was an ally not of Wittenberg, but of Rome, for the "rationalistic axioms" upon which he built his rationalistic system of theology ultimately had to lead him back to the Romanistic camp. What Calvin taught with regard to predestination, the communication of attributes, the Sacraments, the means of grace in general, Church and State, etc., is as far removed from Scriptural truth as are the errors of the Council of Trent, though, of course, Calvin's rationalism produced a different type of error on these points than did Romish rationalism. Hence Dr. Boettner is decidedly wrong in his statement of the antithesis between Luther and Calvin. But he is wrong also when he continues: "Calvin had the great advantage of building on the foundation which Luther had laid. At the time when Calvin came upon the scene, it had not yet been determined whether Luther was to be the hero of a great success or the victim of a great failure. Luther had produced new ideas; Calvin's work was to construct them into a system, to preserve and develop what had been so nobly begun. The Protestant movement lacked unity and was in danger of being sunk in the quicksands of doctrinal dispute; but it was saved from that fate chiefly by the new impulse which was given to it by the reformer in Geneva." What Dr. Boettner here says means that it was Calvin who largely saved the cause of the Reformation from utter destruction. As a matter of fact, however, Calvinism, especially after Luther's death, attacked the Lutheran Reformation as fiercely as did the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation. Any one who has read Dr. Bente's thorough introductions to Articles VII, VIII, and XI (cf. also that to Article II) of the Formula of Concord must agree with this verdict. These masterly introductions, with their

many quotations from Calvinistic sources, certainly bear close study to-day, when orthodox Lutheranism and conservative Calvinism again consider their "common heritage and their differences."

J. T. M.

The Appellation, "Holy Roller," Objected to. — The subjoined letter, which appeared in the *Christian Century* is self-explanatory. "Finding the phrase 'Holy Roller' in Reinhold Niebuhr's article 'Sunday Morning Debate' in the April 22 issue gave me the same feeling as would finding a worm in an apple I was eating. It is a phrase of derision, which has more than one meaning. By some it is used to designate a member of the Pentecostal Church, a denomination which believes in the gift of tongues. By some it is applied to any one who has been converted. It is entirely possible that, if Mr. Niebuhr had occupied one or more of the bunk houses which I have occupied, he would have found himself bearing the nickname 'Holy Roller Niebuhr,' especially if he had been caught reading the Bible, irrespective of what views he might hold on speaking in tongues. In such a bunk house contemptuous nicknames like 'Holy Roller Smitty,' 'Psalmsinging Brown,' 'Jerusalem Jones,' and 'Come to Jesus Johnson' are likely to be applied indiscriminately to any man who is converted. Apparently Mr. Niebuhr and the *Christian Century* both very tolerantly refrain from speaking of a Catholic by the disdainful nickname of 'Mary-worshipper.' Nor do they call a Jew a 'sheeny.' Such tolerance is commendable. Some time, perhaps, they will extend their tolerance to include the Pentecostal people. The most saintly Christian I know is a member of the Full Gospel, or Pentecostal, Church, that is, a 'Holy Roller.' Presumably he suffers when that scornful epithet is applied to him. But he can take it. For he believes that, 'if we suffer' with Christ, 'we shall also reign with Him.'"

A.

The Anniversary of the New York Ministerium. — It was in 1786 that the New York Ministerium was founded in Albany, N. Y. The United Lutheran Synod of New York, formed through the merger of several bodies, one of which was the New York Ministerium, observes the 150th anniversary of the founding of the latter synod this year. An informing article by Dr. G. L. Kieffer, secretary of the 150th anniversary committee, is published in the *Lutheran* of May 21 and May 28. In addition to sketching the history of this synod Dr. Kieffer enters upon the early history of Lutheranism in New York, giving valuable data, mentioning, for instance, that Heinrich Christiansen, who came from Cleve on the Rhine and who in 1611 "began to open up the Hudson Valley to the commerce of the old world," in all probability was a Lutheran. Those interested should obtain a copy of this article.

A.

Cooperatives and Christian Virtue. — Under this heading the *Living Church* of May 23 discusses the Cooperative Movement as to its economic worth and as to its claim of being a sort of means of grace. We submit the following extracts. "The potency of Dr. Kagawa's message about cooperation may be seen by the distinctly discourteous reception accorded him by business organizations in several of our cities. Coming, as he does, just when the Cooperative Movement is gaining its greatest headway in America and traveling mainly under religious auspices, many

journals of Christian opinion are carrying news and comment in which cooperatives seem to receive a special Christian blessing and the accolade of Christian virtue. . . . Usually under the Rochdale plan, a group of consumers organize with each member subscribing for one or more shares of stock at \$5 (yielding the prevailing rate of interest), to be paid for from dividends or by instalments, but none with more than one vote regardless of the number of his shares. 'Patronage dividends,' or rebates, are paid to members in proportion to the amount of their purchases. Price wars with private stores are avoided by selling at the prevailing market price. This is of course a means whereby the consumer seeks to eliminate the middleman's profit and thereby to benefit in the form of lower prices by a direct movement of goods from producer to consumer. . . . So far as we can discover, there is nothing economically 'unsound' about cooperation. Its success as far as it has gone in the United States and its much greater success in Europe provide the practical test. Our interest is rather in its importance as a spiritual and moral force. . . . Frankly, we cannot whole-heartedly endorse the claim made for cooperation by Dr. Kagawa, that it is 'the love principle of economic action.' Cooperation is a readier expression of the Christian attitude than unrestricted competition, of course. But just as cooperation among workers, as seen in labor unions, is ultimately for the sake of more effective competition with employers, so is cooperation among consumers aimed ultimately at coercion of the producer and the total extinction of the middleman. In other words, cooperative enterprise is still after profits of a sort (although admittedly more 'social' in their nature) and directed to a group interest. We have in mind the very possible case of a conflict between a farmers' marketing association seeking to maintain the highest possible urban prices for butter and eggs and a city dairy cooperative trying to drive them down. If there is any truth in the claim that the Christian ethic is better served in the absence of competition, then cooperation (short of owning producers' good as well as consumers') differs from *laissez faire* only in degree, not in kind. . . . It does not follow by any means that cooperation is no 'better' than uncontrolled distribution. We are inclined to believe that it has considerable merit. Indeed, it would be hard to prove it otherwise to the \$1,200-a-year man who can buy a week's groceries at his 'coop' for \$7 instead of \$8 at the 'corner grocery.' At the least it permits cooperative people to live more easily on the income allowed them by the present distribution of wealth. . . . Unless cooperatives control the capital goods market as well as consumers' goods, building and selling dynamos and blast-furnaces along with shoes and cans of peas, they will be in no position to affect the consumers' share of profit in business as a whole. And if their control did embrace purchasing power at its source, it would not be 'cooperation.' It would be revolution!

"To put it all very bluntly, we dissent from the popular attempt to tie a special Christian blessing on the cooperatives. There is too much self-interest in them for that. It is a legitimate self-interest in the struggle between wages and prices, certainly. But let's recognize it for what it is and not claim too much for the movement."

E.

"Jehovah's Witnesses." — That every knock is a boost is a homely proverb, the truth of which the Russellites, or, as they now prefer to call themselves, "Jehovah's Witnesses," experience at present. An eight-year-old boy, Carlton Nichols of Lynn, Mass., whose father belongs to this sect, refused to join his schoolmates in saluting the flag and in singing patriotic songs. When the case was investigated, it developed that the father had taught the boy this attitude and that the former regarded the salute to the flag as homage to the devil's kingdom. The boy thereupon was expelled from school. Incidents of a like nature are reported from several other places in the United States, involving members of the same sect. In one of them the principal was a teacher, who explained her opposition to the saluting of the flag as follows: "As a Christian I am opposed to militarism, to the taking of human life. We cannot salute the flag of love and peace without saluting as well the flag of horror and hate and destruction, for they are one and the same." These incidents have given more publicity to "Jehovah's Witnesses" than any flood of pamphlets issued by them could have procured. The *Christian Century* devotes a long article to the sect, and it is from there that these notes are taken, intended to supplement the material offered on Russellism in *Popular Symbolics*, p. 411 ff. The number of the people adhering to this sect is given as 20,000 for the United States, and an equal number is said to profess this faith in the eighty-three foreign countries in which they are represented. In the United States they are incorporated as the "Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society," in England as the "International Bible Students' Association," and they are "under the leadership of a zealous and forceful former Missouri judge, 'Brother' J. F. Rutherford." While they themselves wish to be called "Jehovah's Witnesses," other names by which they are designated are "Bible Students," "Associated Bible Students," "Russellites." We are told that Judge Rutherford was among the "conscientious objectors" that were sent to prison in 1917 because they opposed our participation in the World War. When he, on May 26, 1919, had been dismissed from the Atlanta prison, he and others arranged a national convention of their sect at Cedar Point, O., where they revised their teachings. Of Judge Rutherford we read: "The distinction gained by prison sentence, his legal training and convincing voice, and above all his prolific pen brought Judge Rutherford rapidly to the fore, despite the fact that the 'pastor' (i. e., Charles T. Russell) did not appoint him as his successor. He has written fifteen volumes, interpreting various books of the Bible as 'types' and allegories of present social, political, and religious conditions, thus providing authoritative Scriptural sanctions for 'revelations.' Although the books are characterized by an indiscriminate and uncritical use of proof-texts, they are attractively made up with illustrations and caricatures. The French versions won first prizes for religious literature in 1933 and 1934 at expositions sponsored by the Ministry of the Interior. They are printed in forty-nine languages and dialects, and last year twenty-six million copies were distributed. Thirty-one pamphlets containing short speeches and polemical essays have also been released by the judge."

How this enormous activity is carried on is in part described in the following paragraph: "This literature is distributed by local companies

of 'witnesses,' who are organized into bands, based on the number of hours devoted to the work; 'pioneers,' giving a minimum of 110 hours a month, and 'auxiliaries,' or 'company publishers' and 'sharpshooters,' serving less frequently. 'God's publicity agents,' Rutherford calls them. They go from door to door showing their 'testimony cards,' selling and giving away *The Harp of God, Reconciliation, Prophecy, Government, et al.* These companies also meet regularly for worship — prayer, song, and study of literature from headquarters, with occasionally a visit from one of the fifteen original directors or an 'ordained representative.'

On the literature which these people are publishing the following paragraph contains enlightening information: "The Watch Tower Society publishes two magazines, the *Watch Tower* and the *Golden Age*. The former is a semimonthly organ containing Bible-studies written by Judge Rutherford, rebukes, exhortations, exposures of apostasy and heresy, notices of Watch Tower radio programs, and letters from companies and individuals. It is by far the most powerful integrating factor in the organization. The *Golden Age* is a vigorously written and well-edited weekly with sections devoted to Labor and Society, Big Business Bits, Educational Flashes, Political, Domestic and Foreign News, where, seasoned with a 'millenarian' interpretation, are some very readable cullings from the news. It plants vigorous and well-directed blows at commercial and military exploiters, is militantly anti-Fascist, and is spoiled mainly by its intemperate Catholic-baiting.

"One hundred and ninety-six 'witnesses,' living in Brooklyn on a cooperative basis, constitute the 'Bethel Family' and, for a salary of fifteen dollars a month each, they man Station WBBR, print and mail the literature, manufacture phonographs and transcription machines (used to play Rutherford speeches when the radio is not convenient), make the 34,997 pounds of ink used in printing, and keep books on the \$700,000 annual budget. Farms in Florida and on Staten Island supply them with a large part of their food.

"All of the literature and the speeches are based on Judge Rutherford's belief that these times demand 'a more strenuous witness' than in 'Pastor' Russell's day. The 'Pastor' had advised, 'Let every soul be subject to the powers that be,' for God had permitted the Gentiles to reign. But the Gentile reign ended in 1914. The kingdom of God is here. 'The powers that be' have become the 'devil's kingdoms.' Many of the old 'Russellites' have found this metamorphosis to 'witnesses' rather trying, but this 'Elisha work' has prevailed over the former 'Elijah work' despite periodical intragroup disputes." A.

A New Tendency in Jewish Apologetic Argumentation. — The *Christian Century* of April 29 contains a lengthy article with the caption "The Jewish Problem." After dwelling on the nature of apologetics employed by the Jews in the past, the editorial says: "But in our day, under the spell of a false tolerance generated, we have reason to fear, by the sentimentalism prevalent at a certain type of conference between Jews and Christians, there is emerging a wholly new kind of apologetic for Judaism. It abandons the claim of theological superiority; indeed, it rejects the concept of *truth* as applied to any religion, its own included.

Instead, it adopts the concept of what we may call cultural fatalism, the doctrine that the connection of religions with particular civilizations makes it impossible for one religion to understand another or for the devotee of one religion to cross over to another. There can be no such thing as interpenetration of faiths. Each religion, being the expression of 'the collective personality of a particular society,' is unique, equally divine with every other religion, and 'as non-transferable and incomparable as is individual personality.' This position is taken by Prof. Mordecai M. Kaplan in his recent book *Judaism in Transition* and by many contemporary Jewish writers. Its practical application is stated by Dr. Kaplan in these words: 'Unless we can so interpret religious differences as to enable us to say, "My religion differs from yours, but yours may be as true for you as mine is for me although I cannot accept yours and you cannot accept mine," we have not attained that religious equality which is the only basis of true tolerance.' In an earlier book Dr. Kaplan proclaims the thesis that Judaism is more than a religion; it is itself a civilization, and he sees it existing within the body of Western civilization permanently unabsorbed, aloof, and culturally autonomous. . . . This new doctrine is put forward by numerous Jewish writers on the naive assumption that its effect will be irenic. In the interest of the growing spirit of friendliness between Jews and Christians the Jewish community should be warned of the opposite effect of such an apologetic upon the spirit of Christian and democratic tolerance. If the Christian community were once convinced that an impassable gulf is fixed between itself and the Jewish community, precluding any possibility of reaching a higher synthesis through tolerant discussion reenforced by the healing and reconciling forces in such a democracy as ours, its spirit of tolerance would shrivel up. The new apologetic for Judaism is not in the interest of better relations between Christians and Jews. It is a counsel of despair. And tolerance cannot live with despair. This apologetic turns the issue back into the hands of fate and holds 'psychological necessity,' or cultural necessity, responsible for a permanently unimprovable situation. A situation that is unimprovable by the interchange of ideas and the sharing of other spiritual goods is a non-rational situation, and as such, a society in pursuit of its own solidarity and integrity can hardly be restrained from resorting to non-rational measures as occasion may arise." That a Christian who believes in the power of the Gospel to change human hearts cannot subscribe to the view which is here attributed to recent Jewish apologists must be very evident. We were wondering, however, in reading the above whether the *Christian Century*, which is violently anti-Hitler, had unwittingly been absorbing some of the ideas sponsored by totalitarian-state advocates.

A.

The Union of Northern and Southern Baptists Not Generally Favored. — When the two large white Baptist denominations of the United States met in St. Louis in May, a number of the leading men were interviewed by reporters as to the likelihood of a merger of these two bodies. Dr. John R. Sampy, president of the Southern Baptist convention, is quoted as saying: "The war is over long ago, and there are many ways in which we can and do cooperate. In the Foreign Mission field, for example.

I do not favor merger, however, because I believe the division of the organization has tended to localize responsibility. If the headquarters of our Baptist organization had remained in the Eastern States, I do not think the Baptist movement would have made such remarkable strides in the South as it has when we Southerners have borne the responsibility. Division makes for efficient management, too." Dr. C. Oscar Johnson, a former president of the Northern Baptist convention, expressed his agreement with Dr. Sampy and added: "To enlarge the Baptist movement by merger would make it unwieldy. The Southern Baptist organization is very large now and faces plenty of administrative problems on account of its size." Dr. James H. Franklin, the president of the Northern Baptist convention, said: "An artificial merger would be useless. We can have the widest measure of cooperation now, but I do not see any rank-and-file demand for our groups to join. I believe all Christians should magnify their points of agreement. If there is ever to be a merger, let it be a natural development." Another prominent Baptist minister declared: "No well-balanced army would consist of infantry only or air corps only. We need spiritual unity, but physical union is unnecessary. And fellowship meetings will give us that unity." Dr. A. A. Shaw, president of Denison University, Granville, O., expressed a different view, saying: "The problem of merger is no longer an academic one. With the action of the Methodists recently, who, like ourselves, separated on the slavery question, and the growing consciousness of our common problems among laymen and ministers alike, it seems to me our two groups will eventually merge. It would of course make a very large organization, but administrative problems could be solved, I think, by some sort of mutual agreement." On the whole, the points submitted on the advisability of a merger strike one as being sensible.

A.

Modernistic Jargonizers. — In reply to the present demand made by liberal Northern Baptists to eliminate from the ministry all who have not had a thorough theological training, the *Sunday-school Times* (November 16, 1935) writes: "Now, when they perceived that they were learned and university men, they marveled at their English. The clique which is planning to eliminate from the Baptist ministry men who, whatever their abilities and consecration may be, have not had a certain routine training, might well use their pruning-hook elsewhere. Confused English is the mark of confused minds. The following sentence is quoted from Dr. Shailer Mathews's *The Atonement and the Social Process*: 'From such a point of view [that all doctrines are derived from the total social life of humanity] the death of Christ is not to be described as satisfaction of dignity or justice, but as an exponent of the forces inherent in the process through whose aid the loss of that which is good conditions the gain of that which is better—a personality more individual, less dependent upon its earlier stages, and more appropriative of the personality-evolving activity of God.' I am tempted to put alongside this [jargon] some extracts from Shailer Mathews's pupil Prof. Stewart Cole of Crozer Seminary, which lie before me, but will refrain out of mercy. But who are really desirable in the leadership of the Church, these jargonizers or the untutored Negro saint, Apolo Kivebulaya?" The reasons why Modernists resort to such theological jargonizing are of course clear. Modernism is only destructive,

never constructive. It has no substitute to offer in place of the precious doctrines which it takes away. Modernism does not want Christianity, but what it wants even its most prominent proponents do not know. Hence it must conceal its theological vacuity under so many empty phrases and expressions. Moreover, Modernism, though essentially pagan, must still parade as Christian; otherwise it could not retain its hold in the Church. Its theological duplicity therefore calls for ambiguity and duplicity in speech. For this reason our modernistic impostors can never measure up to the ancient Greek standard of rhetoric "Simple is word of truth," an axiom which supports our Christian belief in the Bible as the Word of divine Truth, since Scripture, in presenting the way to salvation, is admittedly clear and simple. Very alarming is another report in the same number of the *Times*, which relates that Union Theological Seminary in New York has nine missionary fellowships, held by missionaries in China, Japan, India, Egypt, and Turkey. They run from \$450 to \$750 a year, enabling missionaries to study in this unevangelical seminary. "This," the *Times* says, "constitutes one way of influencing missions in the wrong direction."

J. T. M.

Dr. Morehead Deceased. — The Associated Press reported that on June 1 Dr. John Alfred Morehead, who for the past twelve years was president of the Lutheran World Convention, departed this life. He reached the age of 69 years. In 1910 he resigned the presidency of Roanoke College, Salem, Va., to become the representative of the National Lutheran Council in Europe. He was elected president of the Lutheran World Convention at Eisenach in 1923. Last year he was made honorary president for life.

A.

Some Religious Conventions of This Year. — The quadrennial convention of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (Northern Methodists) met in Columbus, O., the sessions beginning May 1. For the traffic officers it meant a rather considerable increase of work that the Freemasons held their annual meeting in Columbus at the same time. The Methodist Conference consisted of 614 delegates, of whom one-tenth were women. A Methodist paper discussing this conference tells us that on the platform sat the thirty-two regular bishops and several other bishops presiding over dioceses of a special status. Of the bishops one was a Negro and one had come from India and wore his turban. The meetings were held in the public auditorium, the spacious basement of which was used for displaying exhibits giving information about the various activities of the Church. We are told that at these conventions the bishops do not speak unless they are called on by the assembly to do so. One of them, it is true, is the chairman, and this important position rotates among them; but those that are not in the chair are not supposed to deliver speeches unless the request is made by the conference, which, so we are told, does not happen often. One point of debate was the question whether the appointment of the judiciary commission should not be taken out of the hands of the bishops and be given to the General Conference itself. The conservative attitude, which held that the bishops are better qualified to select the proper men than the delegates of the thirty dioceses, who meet only once in four years, prevailed. — Bishop Leonard is credited with a fine statement opposing the social gospel:

"I cannot conceive of the Gospel that Paul preached as having any word of encouragement for any system of philosophy or for any social order or economic theory that would first say that the vital and important thing is man's material welfare. I am not saying that the material welfare is not important. I am saying, however, that first and foremost Jesus Christ came into this world to save the world from sin, and whatever social passion is to have a permanent place in this world must grow out of man's spiritual passion."

One commentator on the convention says: "The hearty reception accorded the Episcopal address made the progressives in the Methodist ranks feel that the Church would not repudiate them in the long run. This much is clear: there will be no split in the Methodist Church over the 'social gospel' issue. And this for two reasons: 1. It is impossible to get any large majority of Methodists aroused over doctrinal matters. It may be because the Methodists are spiritually wise, or it may be that they are ignorant of theology. 2. The real heretic among the Methodists is the man who violates the eleventh commandment, 'Thou shalt not rock the boat.'"

On May 4 the Methodist General Conference approved the plan for unification of the three principal branches of American Methodism by a vote of 470 to 83. Opposition to the adoption was led by Dr. L. O. Hartman, editor of *Zion's Herald* of Boston; Dr. E. F. Tittle of Evanston, Ill.; and Negro delegates. The plan now goes to the annual conferences, where it must obtain the approval of three-quarters of these bodies.

The Southern Baptists and the Northern Baptists both held their large annual conventions in St. Louis. The Southern Baptists claim a membership of 4,389,417 and assert that they are the largest non-Catholic body in the United States. We are told that this convention is of the ultraconservative variety and the least socially minded perhaps within the eighteen cooperating States. This is the opinion of the correspondent in the *Christian Century*. He evidently was not elated when the convention voted to table the report of the special committee on the establishment of a Social Service Research Bureau. This committee had recommended that such a bureau be established and that its functions should be the following: "1. to investigate moral and social conditions as they affect Southern Baptist life; 2. to make available for our constituency accurate information concerning conditions and problems that we face in our churches and community affecting the spiritual, moral, and social welfare of our people; 3. by its approach to our people to seek to improve the moral life of our churches and bring the attitudes of our people on moral and social questions into increasing accord with the mind of Christ; 4. in other ways approved by the convention to seek to enlighten the public mind and arouse public conscience upon all important moral and spiritual issues." It will be agreed that these objectives are not nearly so radical and revolutionary as others that have been recommended. But, as stated above, they were tabled. Prof. John R. Sampey, president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, was reelected president of the convention. In its three seminaries this denomination has 1,191 theological students; last year the number was 883. It supports 400 foreign missionaries. Moneys collected for foreign missions last year totaled \$1,294,613.71.

The Northern Baptist convention was attended by 1,406 regular delegates. The social gospel was given much prominence at these meetings. It was announced by the Commission on Christian Social Action that the peace plebiscite is not yet completed. It seems that the denomination is being polled to find out what the members think of participation in war. When 10,000 ballots had been received, a tabulation was made showing the following results: 42.54 per cent. declared, "I believe I can best contribute to the cause of peace by bearing arms in, or otherwise support, war only in defense of American territory against attack"; 27.62 per cent. stated that according to their view the best course to pursue in the interest of peace was to refuse service in any and all wars; less than 2 per cent. stated they thought it proper to do military service when the Government has declared war. We can well understand that one of the commentators on this convention declared, "Theological controversy has for the time being taken a secondary place." Twenty-one new missionaries, whose work will be financed by the women's boards and the Home Mission Society, were presented. Owing to a special gift from a Baptist church in Los Angeles, the General Foreign Board was enabled to continue its practise of one hundred years' standing, to send out at least one additional worker every year.

A.

Brief Items. — Some Episcopalians are exercised over the statement made by Rev. James M. Gillis, Paulist Father, that King Edward VII died as a Roman Catholic. The story runs that a certain Father Vaughan received the king into the Roman Catholic Church when the latter was on his death-bed. A letter written by one of the secretaries of Queen Alexandra shortly after the death of King Edward and printed in the *Living Church* avers that the story is without foundation. "King Edward lived and died in the Protestant faith." — In a valuable article Dr. George Drach of Baltimore, Md., writing in the *Lutheran*, speaks of the externals belonging to church services. We were interested in the information he gave on the clerical robes used by the pastors of his body in Baltimore: "Only four of our United Lutheran pastors in Baltimore wear no gown at all. All others, thirty, or five-sixths of the ministers, wear the black robe, variously described as 'academic,' 'Lutheran,' 'Geneva,' 'clerical,' 'doctor's gown.' Three still wear white bands and four wear stoles." — This sentence uttered by Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, president of Drew Theological Seminary, and quoted in the *Lutheran* should be pondered by all who think that by means of the proper kind of social legislation they can bring about the millennium: "If the angel Gabriel would set up a perfect social order here on earth to-day, in ten days it would be shot through with the selfishness and greed of the individuals entrusted with its administration." — Another item from the *Lutheran*: "St. Peter's Lutheran Church, North York, held an Easter dawn service supported by congregations and pastors of two other churches, Bethany Moravian Church (the Rev. Theodore Reinke, pastor) and Trinity Reformed Church (the Rev. Allen S. Meek, pastor). . . . The leaflets used in the service were secured from the Moravian congregation at Winston-Salem, N. C., where this service had been conducted for almost two hundred years, a service which annually draws from 35,000 to 50,000 worshipers." — What is the trend of present-day

fiction? On this subject Prof. G. P. Voigt, professor of American Literature, Wittenberg College, using as his caption "From Dickens to Dreiser," writes: "Since the close of the World War our fiction, too, has told a dreary, sordid, and morbid story of disillusionment, disintegration, and even despair. The modern novel, writes one of its historians, has acquired 'the characteristic latter-day smell of decay' and has become 'an out-and-out denial of life.' Writers vie with each other in picturing 'a society disintegrating in crime, deception, and futility.' They sneer at ideals, hope, and the idea of progress. It is the heyday of the 'hard-boiled' fictionists, such as Dreiser, Hemingway, Faulkner, Caldwell, and O'Hara, who reject ideal value and reduce human life to mere sensation. Their stories are full of gin, prostitution, homosexuality, degeneracy, and even idiocy." Concluding his article, the writer thinks that a change has begun to appear in our American literature and that the depression has had a good influence in this respect. We agree with him when he says, "It is only the truth as it is in Christ Jesus that can set us free from the evils of our times." — When we have to deal with a Catholic who points to the many institutions of charity which Romanism supports and conducts, it will not be amiss to quote to him what, according to the *Lutheran*, the Chicago Association of Commerce, upon request, published. The statement is to the effect that in 1935 the Catholics spent \$1,450,600 on charities and welfare work, the Jews \$1,563,888, and the Protestants \$12,818,335. These figures have reference to the city of Chicago. We are told that surveys on charitable activities of religious bodies in New York and other cities indicate a like result. — When the *Lutheran* seminary at Gettysburg, belonging to the U. L. C., held its commencement exercises, it had among its speakers Prof. Gaius Glenn Atkins of Auburn Theological Seminary, belonging to the Presbyterian Church, who spoke on "Effective Preaching," and Dr. John R. Mott, who addressed his audience on "The Challenge Presented to the Christian Church in America by the Present World Situation." If this is not unionism, what is? — While the Northern Methodists met in Columbus, the African Methodist Episcopal Church held its quadrennial meeting in New York. The bishop who opened the meeting strongly spoke for a union of all the Colored Methodist churches. He also demanded justice for the Negro, complaining of disfranchisement of the people of his race at the polls, and bemoaned the fate of the share-cropper and the occurrences of lynching. — The famous Westminster Abbey is to have a new £20,000 organ, to be completed in time for next year's coronation. The organ now in use has been in service for more than two centuries. (*Christian Century*.) — At the meeting of the Southern Baptists in St. Louis in May a missionary of this denomination who is stationed in Spain declared that there are six thousand evangelical people in Spain, twelve hundred of whom are Baptists. — We note in the *Lutheran Standard* that a Minnesota conference of the A. L. C. "declared the trial sermon irregular and not in harmony with the order of the district." This is a good old Lutheran principle, of which we all had better remind ourselves now and then. — In Chicago a Congregationalist who is employed by the Congregational Council for Social Action was recently ordained to the "Ministry of Research." The social-gospel people have the gift of inven-

tion, it must be owned. — Norman Hapgood, formerly United States minister to Denmark and erstwhile editor of *Collier's Weekly*, *Harper's Weekly*, and *Hearst's International*, will be the editor of the Unitarian weekly paper *Christian Register*. — Princeton Theological Seminary, main stronghold of the Northern Presbyterians, has received a new head. President J. Ross Stevenson, who has resigned, is succeeded by John Alexander Mackay, member of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. Prof. Charles R. Erdman, professor of Practical Theology at Princeton, likewise has retired. — A well-known Union Theological Seminary professor, who retires because he has reached the age of seventy, is Dr. William Adams Brown. He held the chair of Applied Christianity. — In the Church of Scotland congregational membership rolls are purged each December. During the last four years this process eliminated 100,000 names. When one is told that the total membership of this Church is not more than 1,250,000, one sees that the loss is alarming.

A.

II. Ausland.

Spiritual Indifference in England. — That religious conditions in England are more and more taking on an ominous aspect is brought out by remarks in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, a copy of which was kindly furnished us by the Rev. H. M. Zorn of Indianapolis, Ind. The writer uses the caption "Semiheathendom" and the subtitle "The Decline of Churchgoing."

"Figures showing how in many parts of the country people are lapsing into 'semiheathendom' were quoted by the Rev. T. G. Mohan, assistant secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society to-day at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen which concluded at St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, on Saturday.

"We cannot be complacent when we are told that in London probably not much more than ten per cent. of the population is regular in its attendance at public worship," Mr. Mohan declared. "In the provinces the percentage is higher, but twenty-five per cent. would be a generous estimate. In Sittingbourne, it is said, only three per cent. of the population go to church. Ignorance and superstition abound, and those who minister in the poorer parishes could supply many parallels to the story of the woman who had her child baptized to "ward off God." Many of our young people, however, though better educated than their forefathers, are scarcely conversant with the main facts of the New Testament, and there is little hope that their children will know even as much.

"Seventy-five per cent. of the children in a Sunday-school in Oxford were stated to be without a Bible in their homes. It would, however, be a mistake to regard the millions who give no outward indication of religious convictions as either hostile to religion or impervious to its influence, but it has virtually no place in their lives. But perhaps an even more serious feature is what the Bishop of Leicester calls the sub-Christian life of many church-members."

"Mr. Mohan asked why the sincere efforts of their parochial clergy had left such a large number of people untouched and an even larger number unimpressed. It was certainly not due to any hindrance imposed by

the State. He thought that they might comfort themselves that it was due in part to the serious understaffing of many parishes throughout the country.

“Our inability to keep pace with the rapid development of the new housing areas and the rivalry of the motor-car and the wireless are creating a grave problem,” Mr. Mohan declared, “and large areas of the country are lapsing into semiheathendom. Hard-pressed incumbents are breaking down under the double burden of a task beyond their powers and of the despair which failure breeds.”

“Among the real causes of their failure were the neglect of pastoral visitation, the lowering of spiritual standards, and the lack of Gospel-teaching and -preaching. ‘The Church’s message to-day is so often a curious mixture of heroic futility and mawkish sentimentality. There is no message for the plain man who knows he is not a hero, but knows he is a sinner.’ What was needed was a campaign of house-to-house evangelism.

“The conference expressed regret at the publication of the Church and State Commission’s report. ‘It deprecates the dissipation of the energies of members of our English Church on controversies that must necessarily be barren at a time when the more urgent question of evangelization and intercommunion and ultimate home reunion call for unprejudiced consideration,’ it was added.

“The conference is convinced that at the present time it would be impossible at a round-table conference to secure agreement on such questions as permissible deviations from the Order of Holy Communion and Reservation, and implores the Archbishops not to revive controversy by calling such a conference.

“The conference denies that there is anything in the existing relations between Church and State that prevents the Church of England from doing the work which is at present being left undone. It is an obligation of a national Church to cooperate with the State in matters concerning the character, conduct, and welfare of its people. The relations between Church and State in England are not matters of purely local concern, but have an influence upon Christian communities throughout the world.”

Pastor Zorn finds the first part of these remarks “a timely introspection,” but justly complains about the second part that it is “so hide-bound.”

A.

Elimination of English Tithe-Rule Plan. — On this topic the *Living Church* submits the following information: —

“The Tithe Bill, which the government has promised to introduce, is the outcome of a Royal Commission report, which recommends a comprehensive scheme for the complete and immediate extinction of tithe rent-charge. To the general principle of the scheme proposed no great objection can be raised. It seems at first sight to embody a reasonable compromise between the rights of the tithe-owning clergy and the present distress of a number of land-owning farmers.

“The N. C. J. C. News Service summarizes the background of the British Tithe Bill as follows: —

“The government has adopted the report of a Royal Commission on the tithe rent-charge. Complicated by a flood of cryptic British terms,

such as 'Queen Anne's Bounty,' 'Benefice Rent-charge,' 'Welsh Church Commission Benefice Tithe Rent-charge,' and other categories of church taxes unfamiliar to Americans, the report boils down to the fact that the centuries-old tithe rent-charge will be eliminated over a period of eighty-five years.

"According to the plan of the Royal Commission the amount of the existing liability of those subject to the tax has been substantially reduced. Since this automatically cuts the revenue of the Church or some lay institution which was beneficiary under the old plan, the state will undertake to make up on a predetermined basis a portion of the loss, which is estimated to be about \$67,000,000 for the Church alone. The Exchequer is issuing what it calls 'tithe redemption stock' to facilitate this protective arrangement.

"*Ancient Land Tax.* The tithe rent-charge referred to was a tax to the value of some two pence (four cents) an acre collected in produce from agricultural areas until 1836, when the fee became payable in cash. Although called a 'tithe,' it was apparently very seldom equivalent to ten per cent. It applied only to certain lands, the income from which was thus taxed for the support of the Church (ecclesiastical tithe rent-charge) or of lay institutions — schools, colleges, hospitals, asylums, etc.

"For centuries the tax was locally collected by the bishop, parish priest, or administrator whose institution was concerned. In 1737, however, it was mainly concentrated in a fund which came to be known as 'Queen Anne's Bounty' — collected nationally and dispensed by a central authority.

"*Many Oppose Scheme.* Many in England oppose the new scheme, particularly the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, which will be seriously affected. The *Church Times* believes it an unwise and inequitable plan since it 'is for the benefit of the landowners from whose land the tithe is [now] payable.' The economic cause of the trouble, asserts this journal, 'has arisen from the fact that during the period immediately after the War a large number of farmers, many of whom had been tenants on the land, bought farms at inflated prices and are to-day heavily embarrassed.' To have helped these men, it continues, would have been justified, but they will not be aided by the plan until the expiration of from forty to sixty years.

"The plan, says the *Church Times*, is 'confiscation.' It adds further, 'If conservatives to-day apply it to the clergy, Communists may hereafter use it to justify land nationalization without adequate compensation.' Even so, it does not want to see the Church agitate against the proposal, but to secure certain modifications by lifting the amount to be guaranteed the Church by the government."

A.

Mohammedanmission. Die Fortschrittsbewegung des Islam ist noch lange nicht zum Stillstand gekommen. Freilich, die Ausbreitung mit Feuer und Schwert hat längst der friedlichen Durchdringung Platz gemacht. In Ostafrika ist der indische Händler, in Westafrika der fluge Haußa-Kaufmann, in Niederländisch-Indien der malaiische Händler und Zauberlehrer der gesuchte Wegbereiter des Islam unter den heidnischen Stämmen. Die paar Bewegungen des Körpers für das notdürftig ausgeführte tägliche Gebet, das Glaubensbekenntnis, die Gebetsformeln und allenfalls ein paar Verse des Koran sind bald gelernt, freilich in einem entsehlig verstümmelten Ara-

bisch, von dem der Vater nichts versteht. Aber das schadet nichts. Einen mächtigen sozialen Aufstieg bringt jeder Übertritt zum Islam. Der Buschneiger wird ein geachteter Mann, der sich mit dem reichen indischen Kaufmann an einen Tisch setzen darf. Der Kastenlose Indiens hat durch den Islam die Möglichkeit, in eine höhere Klasse von Menschen vollberechtigt einzutreten. Der Urwaldbewohner des holländischen Archipels gewinnt durch den Anschluß an den Islam Fühlung mit der modernen Weltkultur.

Ist für die christliche Mission die Lage hoffnungslos? Statistisches Material läßt uns hier im Stich. Wer kann mit Sicherheit in den gefährdeten Grenzgebieten sagen, wer Moslem und wer Heide ist? Der Gifer in der Ausübung der religiösen Pflichten, die Kenntnisse der moslemischen Lehre mögen noch so gering sein, in einigen Jahren wird es sichtbar, daß alle auch nur leise vom Islam angestieken Gemüter im Ernstfall entschlossen Moslems sind. Hier und da leistet das Heidentum wirklich Widerstand. Wir kennen in Afrika und Niederländisch-Indien heidnische Bezirke, die über ein Jahrhundert von moslemischer Bevölkerung eingeschlossen sind und im letzten Augenblick das Christentum dem Islam vorziehen. Aber im ganzen ist das durch das Eindringen der weltlichen Kultur in seinem Lebensnerv getroffene Heidentum kein beachtlicher Gegner der islamitischen Vorwärtsbewegung.

Bei alledem ist es keine Frage, daß die Mohammedanermission zu den schwierigsten Aufgaben der christlichen Kirche gehört. Würde sie den Versuch machen, an den islamitischen Völkern vorbei zu den heidnischen von Afrika und Asien zu gehen, so würden diese ihr mit Recht entgegenhalten, daß sie von der Siegeskraft des christlichen Glaubens erst dann überzeugt werden, wenn sie sich an den nächsten Nachbarn der Christen, den Mohammedanern, bewiesen hat. Dabei steht die Mission immer wieder vor der Frage, wie und wo sie eine Türke zu den Herzen der Mohammedaner finden könne. Der Islam hat seine Anhänger mit einem ähnlichen Überlegenheitsgefühl ausgerüstet, wie es den Christen gegenüber dem Judentum beherrscht. Ihr Prophet hat über das Christentum hinaus die lezte, abschließende Religion, die vollkommene Gottesoffenbarung, gebracht. Der Islam hat seine Anhänger obendrein mit einem leicht erregbaren Fanatismus ausgerüstet, der nur zu leicht in Verfolgung und Gewalttat ausartet. Dabei hat er in erstaunlicher Weise für die verschiedenartigsten religiösen Bedürfnisse gesorgt. Er bietet dem stumpfen Zellachen einfache religiöse Übungen und einen wild wuchernden Überglauken. Er hat für die hochgespannte Geistigkeit große theologische und philosophische Systeme. Er hat für tiefinnerliche Gemüter eine mannigfaltige, hochentwickelte Mystik. So ist die Mohammedanermission noch heute geradezu das Kreuz der protestantischen Mission; möge sie der- einst ihre Krone werden! (Der Pionier; im Luth. Herold zitiert.)

Graf E. Neventhöf, der bekannte Herausgeber des „Reichswart“ und bisher Stellvertreter des Leiters der Deutschen Glaubensbewegung, Prof. W. Hauers, gibt in Folge 13 seines Blattes vom 26. März seinen Lesern bekannt, daß er „aus nationalsozialistischen Gründen und religiösen Motiven“ aus der Deutschen Glaubensbewegung ausgeschieden ist. Der „Reichswart“ trug bisher den Untertitel „Organ der Deutschen Glaubensbewegung“. Dieser Untertitel ist weggefallen. Statt dessen erscheint die Beilage jetzt unter dem neuen Titel „Religion und Leben“. (Ev.-Luth. Freikirche.)

Book Review. — Literatur.

Personality and the Trinity. By *John B. Champion*, Professor of Christian Doctrine, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 268 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$. Price, \$2.25.

This book deals with the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as it has been assailed by Unitarianism in its various forms, by Arianism, and by the related heresies. It is particularly aimed at Modalism (Sabellianism), "as Modalism is in flower to-day" (p. 160), "is one of the great theological menaces to-day" (p. 228) — the difference between Sabellianism and modern Modalism being "that in the former the Trinity of Modes is regarded as successive, while in the latter it is thought of as eternal and, so, as contemporary in manifestation," the essence of both forms of the heresy being that they "give us a mode in place of the God-man, three phases of the activity of one Person in place of three Persons" (p. 244 f.). It enunciates the correct principle that the human intellect cannot comprehend the mystery of the Trinity and that human reason cannot serve as a guide in the study of it. Here are some fine statements: "Human reason is never a finality, for it must depend on the range of facts upon which its conclusions are based, and *with it the facts are never all in*. Only in the mind of God are all the facts present. Hence what the mind of God reveals on any doctrine or subject is final. God Himself is naturally the best Authority on the Trinity" (p. 226). "When we discuss the divine unity, we have a subject as boundless as the whole scope of the divine existence. We may see it in part, but we can never behold all of this infinite triunity. In any case 'we know in part.' " "No true analogy or perfect simile to the Trinity has ever been found or can be found, for the good reason that the Holy Trinity is absolutely unique. All illustrations (the sun as an orb, its rays of light, and its heat; the human memory, understanding, and will) unavoidably darken the subject far more than they illumine it" (p. 80).

Unfortunately the author does not adhere to this principle. He attempts to vindicate the doctrine of the Trinity with philosophical considerations. One chapter of the book deals with "The Trinity in the Scriptures" (chap. II), most of the rest appeals to psychology to make the mystery somewhat intelligible and, in a way, to *prove* the doctrine. The book attempts to show that *correct* psychological thinking demands three persons and one divine essence. "Especially in formulating the doctrine of the Trinity a faulty psychology may do great injury. . . . But we have learned a little more of the psychology of personality. . . . The present treatment seeks to combine psychology with theology in the treatment of *personality* and the *Trinity*" (pp. 117, 97, 92). What does psychology teach concerning personality? "Concretely, *personality is the highest conceivable form or type of life in correspondence or reciprocity with its counterpart or kindred environment, which thus enables it to complete itself; for no living thing is complete in itself*" (p. 51). "The true definition of personality may perhaps be its capacity for love, not for self-consciousness, but for self-sacrifice and life in others. . . . Perhaps the

root of personality is capacity of affection" (p. 128). The characteristic of personality, then, is not self-consciousness, but other-consciousness (p. 61). Now apply this to God; for "personality in God must mean as much more than personality in man as God is more than man." Therefore, "the existence of a sole eternal Person is inconceivable" (p. 70). So we get the doctrine of the Trinity. "Love demands fellowship, and perfect fellowship subsists only between persons who are essentially on the same plane. . . . If the divine life were without this social reciprocity, it would be so contrary to the nature of all known personal life, we could not any more consider it the pattern of the human" (p. 104). "Genuine love has no use for self-consciousness. The Father is Son-conscious rather than self-conscious, and the Son is Father-conscious rather than conscious of Himself" (p. 126). "Since God is love, He cannot be characteristically self-conscious" (p. 128). Some psychologizing theologians seek to demonstrate the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity by defining personality as self-consciousness. "We became self-conscious by distinguishing ourselves from what is not ourselves, and especially from other persons of like nature with ourselves. If, therefore, there were no person objective to God, to whom He could say Thou, He could not say I." (Thus Martensen; see Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I, 480.) But other psychologizing theologians say that is faulty psychology. What we know of love is the key to this mystery of the Trinity. (Thus Sartorius, see Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, 482.) Operating with this psychology of love, Dr. Champion would vindicate the doctrine of the Trinity by means of the doctrine that other-consciousness constitutes personality.

This argumentation is most faulty. In the first place, it operates with a definition of personality which will not be at once accepted. It will require a lot of investigation and demonstration to prove its correctness. Discussing the concept of personality in its bearing on the doctrine of God, Dr. H. L. Willett declares: "Personality is as yet a rather vague term in our psychology. We are finding that we are acquainted with only a limited area of our own personalities" (*The Christian Century*, June 12, 1935). We cannot wait till our psychologists have established an absolutely correct definition of personality. In the second place, this concept of personality (assuming its correctness) does not demand a *trinity* of persons in the Godhead. It is a mere assumption to say that since personality is other-consciousness, "there could not be less; there could not be more" (p. 67). And in the third place, the entire discussion is out of place here. Let personality be what it will, our conception of it must not shape the doctrine of the Trinity. The statements of Scripture must establish and shape the doctrine. Christian theology indeed employs the terms *person*, *personality*, in this doctrine, but only as expressing a truth clearly stated in Scripture. "The term *person* they use as the Fathers have used it, to signify, not a part or quality in another, but that *which subsists of itself*" (Augsburg Confession, Art. I). When Christian theology teaches "that the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are distinct persons, a person being an intelligent subject who can say I, who can be addressed as thou, and who can act and be the object of action," it simply reproduces the statements of Scripture that "the Father says I, the Son says I, the Spirit says I" (Hodge, *Syst. Theol.*, p. 444; cp.

Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*; p. 495 f.). A theology which reverses the procedure, first establishing the meaning of person and personality and then superimposing whatever is found on Scripture, is not Christian, Scriptural theology. A doctrine obtained by this method, says Quenstedt, *destituitur auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae*.

The following quotations illustrate the theological method of Dr. Champion in general. "It has been noted that our Lord often speaks of His love for the Father, but never for the Holy Spirit. Nor is this accidental. The reason is, the Holy Spirit is Love in person. And to love Love is sheer redundancy" (p. 215). That is rather hazy and the reasoning precarious. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth and of the *anhypostasia* ("The Son of God did not take on human personality" [p. 170]) is vindicated with these considerations: "The human life-cell from Mary was not personality in embryo, for never by itself could it develop into embryo or person. Only when the complementary male and female chromosomes unite in conception does personality originate. This is infallibly the generic law of the reproduction of human life." That, in effect, *limits the "With God nothing shall be impossible,"* Luke 1, 37.

TH. ENGELDER.

The Origin of Mankind. By Ambrose Fleming. 160 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8$. Marshall Morgan & Scott, Ltd., London and Edinburgh. Price, \$1.40.

Mr. Fleming is president of the Philosophical Society of Great Britain. His scientific standing is secure through his work for television and in electrical engineering. He is a believer in the Holy Scriptures and accepts as the essential basis of Christianity the deity of Jesus Christ and His office as Redeemer of the world, who by His atonement reconciled God and man. To this faith he bears witness in the present volume as in former products of his pen. However, we cannot subscribe to the fundamental thesis of the present volume. Mr. Fleming believes that there were human beings before Adam and that a reference to a race of non-Adamic beings is alluded to in Gen. 4, 14—17. These races of the human stock were "ethically inferior"; yet they were human, "human in the sense of not being a product of the animal races or generated from them by merely some automatic process" (p. 132). He distinguishes these races specifically from Adam and his descendants by assuming that this creature "had moral and spiritual faculties not sufficiently given so as to permit it to be described as made in the 'image of God'" (p. 132). Since creation throughout the plant and animal world has proceeded along certain stages, "it is consistent with all we know of divine creative operations that this initial step should be followed up by the creation of a being more adequately endowed with the necessary higher nature. Accordingly, we meet in the first chapter of Genesis with the divine resolution expressed in the words 'Let us make man in our image after our likeness,' Gen. 1, 26" (p. 133). Accordingly, we are to recognize "that the account of the Adamic creation given us in the first two chapters of the Book of Genesis is the account of the creation of a special race of men and not that of mankind as a whole" (p. 134). Looking about in the world of humanity to-day, Mr. Fleming assumes that "the unquestionably superior Caucasian branch is alone the derivative by normal generation from the Adamic man"

(p. 137). On the other hand, the Mongolian, Negro, and other human species are a survival of the pre-Adamic man. We must declare our dissent from this view, in the first place, because of the consistent teaching of Scripture that mankind is one. The entire argument of the fifth chapter of Romans rests on this fact, and we have the specific declaration of Acts 17, 26 — a statement which cannot have been made with a mental reservation regarding the black, yellow, and brown races, which were known to the Greeks. Mr. Fleming's reiterated statement declaring that a difference in species exists between the Caucasian race and the rest as well as his claim that in the case of intermarriage between Caucasians and Negroes "the progeny are usually feeble, not long-lived, and of poor *psychical* quality" (p. 116) are simply not in accord with facts. On the contrary, hybrid races such as the Mulatto and certain mixtures of Semitic and African stock, are very vigorous both mentally and physically. An important difference is found also, according to Fleming, between the Caucasian and other languages. He declares that "the Negro languages are also simple and not adapted for conveying any but the simplest ideas and thoughts" (p. 117), whereas a simple reference to any handbook of comparative philology would have convinced the author of the astounding wealth of grammatical structure and vocabulary, for instance, of the Bantu group of African dialects. Both from the standpoint of Biblical exegesis and anthropology we consider the case made out by Mr. Fleming for the existence of non-Adamic races a very poor one. It should be said that he seizes upon this device because of the existence of certain fossil forms, as the Neanderthal race and similar specimens, which he prefers to view as remains of the pre-Adamic race. The fundamental error of his reasoning is to be found in the concession that the age of these finds takes us back to a period some 50,000 years earlier than the Old Testament era.

While we cannot accept the theory here proposed in order to account for the origin of mankind, we should say that the book contains very meritorious chapters, describing the fundamental differences between man and animal and outlining the fundamental propositions of modern physics and chemistry. There is a good refutation of the nebular hypothesis (p. 57 f.) and also an interesting argument for creation, based upon the discovery that matter is essentially composed not of corpuscles, but of waves or radiation. Arguing from the laws of thermodynamics, he concludes that the energy which is active in the universe came into it from outside and that the universe therefore had a starting-point, or beginning, at some time past not infinitely remote (p. 27 ff.).

THEODORE GRAEBNER.

Wir lesen Luther. Gegenwartshilfe zum Verständnis des reformatorischen Wortes. Herausgegeben von Lic. theol. Otto Uust. Heft 1. Martin Luther: "Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen." 90 Seiten 6×8½. Preis, kartoniert: RM. 1.80.

Wir zitieren aus dem Vorwort des Bandes: "Der Plan zu dieser Arbeit ist aus dem Dienst an der Gemeinde hervorgegangen. . . . Das Schriftchen möchte Lust zum wirklichen Kennenlernen Luthers in weite Kreise tragen, vielleicht auch in solche, die zwar den innerkirchlichen Auseinandersetzungen unserer Tage fernstehen, aber irgendwie auf das Problem Reformation und deutsche Gegenwart"

geslohen sind und von den Dingen mehr wissen wollen als bloße Schlagworte. . . . Die Sprache Luthers ist sowohl im Wortschatz wie in der Sachbildung möglichst getreu erhalten. Dagegen sind Rechtschreibung und Beugungsformen dem heutigen Gebrauche angeglichen. Die kleingedruckten Anmerkungen dienen der Erklärung der dem heutigen Sprachgebrauch entfremdeten Wörter sowie dem Verständnis cultur- und zeitgeschichtlich bemerkenswerter Ausdrücke und Anspielungen." Die Anlage des Büchleins ist derart, daß immer ein Abschnitt in Luthers eigenen Worten geboten wird, worauf dann Auslegungen und Anwendungen, besonders auf deutschländische Verhältnisse, gemacht werden. Wenn Luther auf diese Weise in weiteren Kreisen Deutschlands gelesen und studiert wird, so kann dies nicht ohne reichen Segen geschehen. Es wäre zu wünschen, daß man auch in den Kreisen unserer Pastoren, sonderlich in kleineren Konferenzen, sich auf diese Weise mit Luther beschäftigen würde.

P. E. Kreßmann.

Why I Believe the Bible. By Wm. H. Richie. The Sunday-school Times Book Service, Philadelphia. 31 pages. Price, 15 cts. Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Twenty-five years ago the writer of this pamphlet was a Liberal, "the product of the destructive antireligious influences prevailing at one of our largest universities." He accepted the "modern point of view" as "scientific" and "logical" and cast aside his Christian faith. By God's grace he was won back to the faith of his fathers, and now he gratefully employs a part of his time in writing and publishing booklets defending the Bible and the Christian faith against infidelity. Other pamphlets of his are: *Why Read or Study the Bible? Why Pray? Why Four Different Gospels?* While the reviewer could not subscribe to every statement in *Why I Believe the Bible*, it is, on the whole, a good presentation, in popular and appealing language, of the evidence which Christian apologetics offers in defense of the divine character of God's Book. A useful pamphlet in the hand of a pastor or teacher when instructing Bible and other classes.

J. T. MUELLER.

Sermons on the Commandments. By the Rev. Wm. Masselink, Th. M., Th. D. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 223 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$. Price, \$1.50.

The purpose which the reading of this book will serve a Lutheran pastor is that he learns how a pastor of the Reformed Church presents to his congregation the will of God as expressed in the Decalog and especially how this is done from the specific viewpoint of that Church. I shall give a sample. Dr. Masselink says: "We are not saved because of good works. . . . Salvation by good works is a criminal doctrine. . . . Our salvation is complete in Jesus Christ. Jesus said on the cross, 'It is finished.' Now, what our Christ has finished we certainly don't have to do over or supplement. Paul says that, if we are saved by the Law, then Christ died in vain. Salvation by the works of the Law is impossible, once more, for God requires a perfect obedience. The thrice-holy God must require a perfect obedience. The sinner, neither converted nor unconverted, can render this perfect obedience" (p. 9. and 10). All this is said clearly and emphatically. In view of these statements it makes strange reading when in the very next sermon, on "Has the Law Still Value for the Christian?" Dr. Masselink, among other things, says:

"Real salvation is to be saved from sin itself. It is to hate sin as sin, not only because of the consequences of sin. In other words, to be restored in God's favor and to obediently do His will. Now, His will is contained in the Ten Commandments. What is the meaning of salvation? It not only means to be free from the guilt and punishment of sin. This is only half of its meaning. The other part is equally important, namely, to be saved from sin's power. It has been said that, when we are saved, we have nothing more to do with the Law. That this is not so can be seen. When we are saved, we are saved *from what?* You answer, From sin, because it is written; 'He shall save His people from their sins.' We are therefore saved from sin. But what are we saved to? You answer, We are saved unto holiness. Very well; but what is holiness? Holiness is conformity to the Law of God. Try as you will, you will never get the Law out of the concept of salvation. It is an important part of it. 'If ye love Me, keep My commandments,' says Jesus. The Law is fulfilled in us personally. How can that be? you ask. We reply with the words of the apostle: 'What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh,' Christ has done and is still doing through the Spirit, 'that the righteousness of the Law may be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.' Through regeneration the Law is fulfilled, for when man is reborn, he becomes the recipient of a new nature which loves the Law of God. This new nature, which God has implanted in every believer, is incapable of sin and cannot sin because it is born of God. When the Apostle Paul describes this inward conflict, he shows that he himself, his real and best self, did keep the Law; for he says: 'So, then, with the mind I myself serve the Law of God.' He also tells us that he 'delights in the Law of God after the inward man' " (pp. 20, 21).

At one time Dr. Masselink says, because God requires a perfect obedience, it is impossible for the sinner to be saved by the works of the Law, for neither the converted nor the unconverted man can render a perfect obedience. At another time he says that obedience to the Law belongs to the very essence of our salvation. Evidently he means to say with the second statement that the converted man must bring forth the fruits of faith, good works. That is very true. But why not say that? Why use words which must confuse the hearer? Why say what is actually contrary to the Scriptures? When Paul says: "If by grace, then is it no longer of works," Rom. 11, 6, then we have no right to say that obedience to the Law "belongs to the very essence of our salvation" (p. 19). We must remember that the Christian still has the Old Adam and therefore daily sins and does not render a perfect obedience; again, we must bear in mind that the Christian does good works *after* he has been converted, *after* he has accepted Christ and *is in full possession of his salvation*; good works therefore are the result of his conversion and not a determining factor. Dr. Masselink does not properly distinguish between justification and sanctification in their relation to each other. The man who still believes that obedience to the Law belongs to the very essence of his salvation can never have a good conscience. Nor will it help him that Dr. Masselink says that the new nature which God has implanted in the believer is incapable of sin, for, after all, the Christian, still having the Old Adam, does sin; Paul says: "I know that in me,

that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." Rom. 7, 18. Unless a man knows that his salvation is altogether by grace, he cannot be sure of his salvation.

Dr. Masselink says that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week (p. 107). There is no Scriptural proof for this; the Sabbath, also the weekly Sabbath, being part of the Old Testament Ceremonial Law, was abrogated by the very coming of Christ. Dr. Masselink says that a Christian should abstain from liquor (p. 146). In answering objections to this statement, he says: "O, says another, but did not Jesus make wine at Cana of Galilee? Yes, He did. Nor am I interested in the question whether it was fermented or not. I do want to say that, if the world had never known anything more intoxicating and harmful than what Jesus made at Cana of Galilee, no one would have even thought of passing liquor laws" (p. 147). What a strange interpretation of Scriptures! An unbiased reader of John 2 will understand the record to say that at the wedding in Cana real wine was used and that Jesus not only changed the water into some real wine, but even into wine that was better than was first served. So the record expressly says: "When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine and knew not whence it was, (but the servants which drew the water knew,) the governor of the feast called the bridegroom and saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now," vv. 9, 10. Four times the word *olwos* is used. It is exactly the same word which Paul uses when he says: "Be not drunk with wine," Eph. 5, 18. No one can get drunk on grape-juice.

Of the Sacraments Dr. Masselink says: "Time forbids us here to say much about our worship through the Sacraments. Let it be remembered that what God hath joined together man may not separate. God has granted us two means of grace as channels whereby He bestows His divine gifts upon us: the Word and the Sacraments. It is our duty as Christians to make use of both means of grace with deep gratitude of heart and humble obedience of spirit. The means of grace do not save us. They have no inherent power in themselves to save. Apart from the Spirit of God they are insufficient. Nevertheless, it remains true that through the means of grace God has been pleased to bestow the salvation wrought in Jesus Christ. Through the right use of the Word and Sacraments we are conformed to the image of God through mutual fellowship" (pp. 63, 64). Again he says: "In the second place, the Sabbath ideal of fellowship with God is realized by the Church through use of the Sacraments. This is true of both Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism came in the place of circumcision. When was circumcision instituted? Just before the covenant was established with Abraham. What was the significance of this covenant? Fellowship between God and Abraham. Why must circumcision precede the establishment of this covenant, this fellowship between God and Abraham? Because this original fellowship was broken by sin. The impurity, or sin, must first be removed before the fellowship can be established. This is the meaning of circumcision. Now Baptism has come in the place of circumcision.

The impurity, or sin, is removed before the covenant fellowship is restored. This is done by the water which signifies the washing away of our sins. So through the Sacrament of Baptism the idea of fellowship is realized.

"This same truth is evidenced in the Lord's Supper. The Lord's Supper has come in the place of the Old Testament Passover. In the Passover Feast there were two significant acts: a) The blood was first applied. b. The communion with God was again established through the eating of the paschal lamb. Sin broke the fellowship between God and Israel. Therefore the blood was first applied to remove sin, and after that the true purpose of the Passover was realized, namely, communion with God. In the Lord's Supper the essential thought is communion with God. Therefore Christ speaks of His blood in the institution of the Lord's Supper as the blood of the covenant. So we see that through the Sacraments the Sabbath ideal of communion with God is realized. Therefore it is a matter of deep importance for us how we observe the Sacraments" (p. 112).

Although Dr. Masselink speaks of the Sacraments as "means of grace," he does not do so in the Scriptural sense and as is taught by our Lutheran Church, the Sacraments actually being means of God's grace and not merely signifying the putting away of our sins.

It is strange that theologians of the Reformed Church whom we credit both with erudition and sincerity should so tenaciously hold to doctrines which are contrary to the express words of Scripture. The Calvinists, to refer to another instance which comes to our mind, deny *universal* grace; they teach that Christ did not die for all sinners, but only for the elect. As a proof they cite Matt. 20, 28: "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many," emphasizing that it says "*for many*" and thereby trying to prove that Christ did not die for all. But they entirely overlook the fact that the same Scriptures expressly say: "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom *for all*, to be testified in due time," 1 Tim. 2, 5, 6, and also the fact that the Scriptures in many places *clearly* teach *universal* grace. But pointing out *their* inconsistencies to them and their wrong presentation of Scripture, contrary to the plain words of Scripture, does not seem to move them at all. They tenaciously hold to their false teachings, and thereby *they* bring about that division in the Church of which Christ speaks Luke 12, 51. Over against such division Christ bids us to hold fast to the truth, both for our own sakes and also for the sakes of others, that through His truth His name may be glorified.

J. H. C. FRITZ.

Quellen zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Unterrichts in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands zwischen 1530 und 1600. Erster Teil. Quellen zur Geschichte des Katechismusunterrichts. III. Ost-, Nord-, und Westdeutsche Katechismen. 1. Abteilung. 2. Hälfte, 3. Lieferung. Jo h a n n Michael Reu. VI und 297 Seiten 6½×9½. C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Preis, kartoniert: M. 15.

Mit dieser Lieferung kommt laut Ankündigung des Verfassers sein monumentales Werk zum Abschluß. Über dreißig Jahre hat D. Reu sich mit der Herausgabe dieses Werks beschäftigt, dem Jahre emsiger Forschung und Sichtung

des Materials vorangingen. Es ist bezeichnend für den eisernen Fleiß und die unermüdliche Ausdauer des Verfassers, daß er trotz der Hindernisse, die ihm in diesen Jahren entgegentraten — die weiten Entfernungen, der Weltkrieg, seine sonstigen beruflichen und schriftstellerischen Arbeiten, um nur die hauptsächlichsten zu nennen —, sich nicht hat entmutigen lassen, dies gediegene, gründliche Werk zu vollenden. Diese Lieferung enthält neben etlichen Braunschweig-Hannoverschen Katechismen (Hoya-Diepholz, Osnabrück, Schaumburg-Lippe, Lippe-Detmold, Walde) die westfälischen, nassauer und rheinischen Katechismen. Auch in dieser Lieferung ist das Material bei aller Gründlichkeit in so interessanter und fesselnder Weise dargestellt, daß man ein lebendiges Bild der geschilderten Verhältnisse bekommt, so daß nicht nur der Katechetiker, sondern auch der Kirchenhistoriker reichen Nutzen von der Lektüre haben wird. Wir wünschen dem Werke hilben und drüben recht viele anerkennende Leser.

Th. Vätsch.

Christian Ethics. By *Johann Michael Reu*, Th. D., Litt. D., professor at Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, in conjunction with *Paul H. Buehring*, A. M., D. D., professor at Capital University, Columbus, O. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 1935. 482 pages, 5×8. Price, \$2.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

When a well-balanced and scholarly book on Christian ethics appears in its circles, any denomination has the right to hail such appearance as a real event. Lutherans in America have a special reason for being appreciative in this point, because comparatively few comprehensive works on ethics have been produced in their midst. Lutheranism in Germany, it is true, has given the world splendid and famous treatises in this field, — the name of Harless at once comes to mind, — but they are written in what is rapidly getting to be a foreign tongue to Lutherans in America, even in circles where fifty years ago German reigned supreme; and moreover, they do not treat the peculiar problems of American life. Apart from all this, a fresh treatment of Christian ethics is periodically to be welcomed on account of constantly changing conditions and the never-ceasing advent of new perplexing problems, just as the issuance of new works on Christian Doctrine at not too great intervals is desirable, not as though the truth changed and new doctrines were required, but because the antithesis is constantly taking on different forms. In our synodical seminaries the subject of ethics has always been treated in the courses on Dogmatics and Pastoral Theology, a procedure which assures the right basis for the discussion, though it necessarily precludes a systematic presentation of the whole subject. The authors of the present treatise, Dr. Reu and Dr. Buehring, have followed a different course in their theological teaching. They have given, and are giving, a special course in Christian ethics, and the book is the outgrowth of their lectures in this field. For the benefit of his students Dr. Reu published in 1914 his *Christliche Ethik in kurzer Skizzierung*, which appeared in a second edition in 1922. He revised and expanded all this material except that pertaining to social ethics, and Dr. Buehring translated the revised draft into English, furnishing at the same time as his own special contribution the section on social ethics (pp. 256—396). The latter likewise drew up the index, while the extensive, valuable bibliography (pp. 415—458) was compiled by Dr. Reu.

The book is one that we can be grateful for. The presentation is clear and appealing and often enhanced by quotations from Luther and other renowned theologians, and the teachings submitted are based on the Scriptures and the Confessions. That the book is carefully divided into sections and chapters, the latter of which, as a rule, are brief, is a decided advantage for the teacher and the student. The large type and the convenient size of the book are further external features inviting one to read and study. The contents of the book are remarkably rich. After introductory chapters dealing with definitions and giving the pertinent historical material, the Christian life is treated in three parts: The Origin of Christian Life; The Preservation and Development of the Christian Life; The Consummation of the Christian Life. To mention some of the special topics, here one finds information on man's state by nature, conscience, conversion, faith, hope, and love, prayer, marriage, the Christian congregation, Church and State, the right of inaugurating a revolution, "white" lies, the race question, capital and labor, death and the hereafter. One can see at once how important and timely the subjects are which the authors have discussed. At several places, it is true, we could not give our approval to the views expressed, or we regretted that the right position, which the authors evidently intended to sponsor, was not stated with more fulness and definiteness. To advert to one matter chiefly, on p. 131 we met statements which are somewhat mystifying and disconcerting. There we are told that, when God, in converting the sinner, works upon him with the Law, the sinner becomes "conscious of God's terrible wrath over sin and this consciousness strikes him down (*terrores conscientiae incussi*), crushes his heart, and temporarily brings to a halt his natural resistance, *i. e.*, it makes him *mere passive* (Form. Conc., Art. II. 54). But the Word of God is also Gospel; it is the message of divine grace, of forgiveness of sins through Christ, full of life-giving power. In the *very moment* — because Scripture knows of no state of religious neutrality — when man through the Law has been made entirely passive, the Gospel points him to Christ and His inviting Savior-love, and the Spirit, working through that Gospel in a mysterious, creative way, brings about a new understanding and new powers of the will, new inner motions. He provides, again through the creative power of the Word, the organ which is able to receive the Word, even Christ Himself as a personal Savior. This organ is faith," etc. We are at a loss how to understand the function here ascribed to the Law. The meaning seems to be that the Law so humbles a sinner that he no longer looks for aid in himself, but admits his own utter inability to procure God's pardon. But how the sentence that the Law so works upon the sinner that it "temporarily brings to a halt his natural resistance" can be held, we are unable to see. The remark about "noble souls" (p. 121) is not tenable, because "the longing to be free from the contradiction to God's will as well as this consciousness of such contradiction itself" is found not only in noble souls, but in every rational human being; in the unconverted, however, this longing is not that of happy submission, but of dissatisfaction with God's severe demands or of despair. Even "noble souls" like Paul before his conversion do not constitute an exception. We likewise feel that the remarks

about the "prayers" of the unconverted (p. 177) should be recast.—With the exception of a few *naevi*, which can be excised in a second edition, the book goes on its way with our cordial recommendation. W. ARNDT.

The Man who Said He Would, and Other Sermons. By *William Edward Biederwolf*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 163 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$. Price, \$1.00.

Although the twelve sermons here offered do not have the form to which we generally adhere in our preaching, being sermonic addresses or lectures rather than sermons, they contain many stimulating thoughts, some of them actually epigrammatic in force, as when the author says (p. 41): "It was like the Lord that His pity should rest especially upon Peter. He went not first to John, who loved Him most, but to Peter, who needed Him most"; p. 120: "A man's morality is the mere outward adornment of the flesh; a Christian's righteousness is the fruit of the indwelling Spirit, the Spirit of Christ"; p. 143: "What we need, says Paul, is not greater manifestation, but greater love; not more speaking with tongues, but more loving with hearts; not more action, but better motives." The author's emphasis in some cases is not sufficiently strong in the interest of the fundamental truths of Christian doctrine; there is more moralizing than indoctrinating. Expository preaching is in keeping with the best models of the Apostolic Age and the tradition of almost twenty centuries. It is the only kind of preaching that will actually work conviction.

P. E. KRETMANN.

Healing in His Wings. By *Alfred Doerffler*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 32 pages, in loose-leaf form. Price, net, 10 cts., postpaid.

Many a pastor will welcome these brief meditations in loose-leaf form, which may be left at the bedside or the home by the pastor. The author offers sixteen meditations on choice Scripture-passages, well suited to their purpose of comforting, admonishing, encouraging, the patient on his sick-bed or the lonely shut-in. The meditations are brief, none exceeding a page and a half, and are followed by a short prayer. The type is clear and readable.

TH. LAETSCH.

Nach Schrift und Erfahrung ist der überhandnehmende irdische Sinn eine der größten Gefahren, die uns Christen und der Kirche überhaupt in dieser lebten Zeit der Welt drohen. 43 Seiten $7 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. Preis: 25 Cts. portofrei. Zu beziehen von Arnold F. Nuoffer, 300 Falls Blvd., North Tonawanda, N. Y.

Dieses Synodalreferat (Östlicher District, 1934), das im betreffenden Synodalbericht nicht Platz fand, jetzt aber mimeographiert vorliegt, weist nach, wie auch in unserer Mitte der irdische Sinn überhandnimmt und nach und nach immer weitere Gebiete des kirchlichen Lebens zerrüttet. P. E. Tozle weiß sich verständlich zu machen; er nimmt auch bekanntlich kein Blatt vor den Mund. Es sieht bei uns nicht gut aus. Und einem jeden von uns tut es not, ernstlich mit sich ins Gericht zu gehen. Dieses Schriftchen wird ihm dabei treue Dienste leisten.

Th. Engelder.

The Waiting Drummer and Other Verse. By *Wm. M. Runyan.* 96 pages, 7×5. Price, \$1.00. Fleming H. Revell. Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Wm. Marion Runyan, editor of the Moody Bible Institute, has put sixty-five of his poems into this little volume. The selections cover a large variety of subjects and are religious in nature. Some are veritable gems and give a happy, unusual turn to some of the Bible events. "Zebedee's Call" is one of these. "Being Let Go," in memory of the well-known Annie Johnson Flint, is excellent. Our pastors will find many of these poems quotable for their sermons.

W. G. POLACK.

Calwer Kirchenlexikon. Kirchlich-theologisches Handwörterbuch, in Verbindung mit sachlündigen Mitarbeitern herausgegeben von Friedr. Keppler. Erster Band, A—K. Erste Lieferung. Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart. 144 Seiten 7½×10¾. Preis der ersten Lieferung, gehäftet: RM. 2.50.

Es liegt hier das erste Heft eines neuen Kirchenlexikons vor, das nach dem Plan des Herausgebers ein zweibändiges Handwörterbuch werden soll. Die einzelnen Artikel sind demgemäß kurz und sachlich gehalten, aber bis auf die Gegenwart fortgeführt, so daß z. B. bei Abesinien der italienische Eroberungskrieg mit berücksichtigt ist. Entschieden weniger erfreulich ist, daß sogar in diesem Werk die leidige Evolutionstheorie sich breitmacht (sub Abstammungslehre) und daß beim Abendmahl gesagt wird: "Der am Kreuz sich opfernde Heiland ... spendet den Jüngern unter den Sinnbildern von Brot und Wein seinen Leib und sein Blut." Druck und Ausstattung des Werks versprechen das Beste.

P. E. Kremann.

Eingegangene Literatur.

In *Luthertum* für Mai findet sich außer einem Artikel von Harris Birkeland über "Die alttestamentliche Offenbarung als Gesetz und Evangelium" und einer längeren Ausführung von Johannes Sperr über "Luthers Lehre vom Beruf und ihre Auswirkungen für die Gegenwart" besonders ein recht interessanter Artikel von Ernst Straßer über "Bugenhagens reformatorische Bedeutung". — *Theologie der Gegenwart* bietet interessante Besprechungen über neue Predigtbücher und über Neuerscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Hymnologie und Liturgik und des Kirchenrechts.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Aug 30" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

